THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 10. JANUARY, 1934. Vol. XXIII.

MODERN CHURCHMEN, AWAKE!

By the Editor

THE combination of the English Church Union and the Anglo-Catholic Congress under the leadership of the venerable Viscount Halifax and the hardly less venerable Bishop Chandler is an event of no little importance in the history of the Church of England and may be rightly looked upon as the consummation of the celebration of the Centenary of the Oxford Movement. The new society, to be entitled the Church Union, should, so Lord Justice Slessor calculated, have a membership of 40,000, but which he devoutly hoped might shortly reach 50,000. In the presence of such numbers, the Modern Churchmen's Union, with its 1,200 members, will seem as insignificant as did the Spartans at Thermopylae in the eyes of the Persian invaders, or as the little band of Jewish patriots under Judas Maccabaeus when facing the alien hosts of Bacchides at Eleasa.

This new Anglo-Catholic combination will be sufficiently formidable to impress, if not on occasions to intimidate, the politicians and the press. It will certainly be able to impose its will on the representative Church bodies and to 'squeeze' the bishops. It may be urged that we take too apprehensive a view of this new combination: that we ought to realise the way in

which Modernism is permeating Anglo-Catholicism, and to feel in consequence some assurance that this new combination will be increasingly liberal in its aims, comprehensive in its sympathies, and progressive in its policy. There is no doubt that the ablest of the Anglo-Catholic leaders are becoming slowly but surely Modernist, but can we hope that these excellent men are going to lead the new combination? We can have no reasonable hope that they will be able to do this. The aim of the new combination is undoubtedly reactionary: its distinguished leaders, whose piety and devotion we revere, cannot be credited with Modernist sympathies, and the rank and file of their followers are fanatically opposed to Modernism.

Le Modernisme, voila l'ennemi is their motto. They feel, of course quite wrongly, that Modernism is undermining the Christian Faith: that Modernism is responsible for the growing alienation of the English people from organized Christianity. The most convincing proof of this in their eyes is the attitude of the Roman Catholic authorities towards Modernism. *Ecrasez l'infâme!* Rome has stamped it out. It is true that the English Church in its constitution, ideals and spirit differs widely from the Church of Rome. It is true also that English Modernists in their theology and methods, differ in many respects from the Roman Catholic Modernists, but the new militant Anglo-Catholic combination will be in no mood to recognize these differences and so modify its policy. Said the Anglo-Catholic wolf to the Modernist lamb: 'If it was not you, as you say, why then it was your parents, and in any case I am resolved to kill you.' We cannot condemn those who stand strongly for their principles and are resolved to promote them, but we have to recognize that if they are not to prevail, active steps, demanding skilful combination, intrepid action and personal self-sacrifice will be needful, not simply to check, but to defeat this effort.

We have to admit that the prevailing temper in the Church and Nation is not at present favourable to such an effort. Financial stress and strain absorb the attention of many and leave neither energy, money nor leisure for what is called 'idealist propaganda.' The temper of the times is reactionary in Christian circles. The Bolshevik anti-Christian crusade, the materialistic propaganda of the Communists, and the excesses of the post-

war decadence are responsible for this reactionary temper. The policy now is to defend Christian institutions at all costs, to cease criticizing them, and to give up trying to reform them.

> Be to their virtues very kind,
> Be to their faults a little blind.

But inasmuch as the Modernist Movement has sprung out of the spirit of criticism produced by new knowledge and the desire for reform due to apprehension at the growing enfeeblement of the Christian religion in personal and social life in the modern world, the Modernist finds himself in the presence of a Christian public very much less sympathetic to his ideals and less interested in them than was the case fifteen years ago. When the 'spirit of the trenches' was permeating the English Church, mainly as the outcome of the experiences of our English chaplains at the front, projects of Christian reunion based upon Church reform, whether institutional, liturgical or doctrinal, were much more popular than at present. The Church of England, during the last decade, has been passing through a process which is best described in the Hebrew prophet's phrase as 'settling on its lees.'

Some who are still alive, at least physically, would find it difficult, when they recall what they felt and thought and did and said in the early post-war period, to answer without shame that question which St. Paul addressed to certain of his backsliding converts, 'Where is then the blessedness ye spake of?'

In summoning Modernists to awake and gird themselves for action we are aware that we are not doing what is likely to be well received either in Modernist circles or by the press and public. As a community, we are weary of stunts and slogans and missions and campaigns. Of recent years, too many of them have ended in complete failure to make people generally sympathetic towards new efforts. The bulk of the nation is we fear to-day indifferent to the National Church and its fortunes. It seems to the British public to be incapable alike of inspired effort or of real understanding of the modern man and his moral and spiritual needs. In their eyes the Church is doomed either to stagnation or to fanaticism.

As for Modernists, it must be confessed that they are often too well satisfied with what the movement has already achieved and much too optimistic of its future success to make them will-

ing to undergo heroic and self-sacrificing efforts to secure for their principles and policy a dominating and permanent influence in the life of the National Church. They do not realize that Modernism has not yet achieved a dominant and permanent position in the Church of England. To-day, Modernism is like an attacking force which is half-way between its objective and the trenches from which it has advanced. In such a position it has no secure lodgement, and may at any moment be obliterated by a resolute and well-organized Anglo-Catholic counter-attack. All that Modernism has achieved up to the present, as the result of its educational efforts, has been little more than the general acceptance of a few fundamental modern truths: tolerance for a number of other truths: and above all tolerance and freedom for Modernist teachers within the ministry of the Church of England. But none of these things have any secure footing within the Church of England either in its laws or its dogmas or its liturgies. They merely exist on sufferance, and a change in the respective strengths of the contending schools and in the tone and temper of the Church authorities might end this condition of things to-morrow. It is not only the duty of Modernists to secure what they have already accomplished for those that come after, though to do this would be no easy or slight achievement, but also to advance to that objective which Modernism has set before it and to entrench their principles securely there.

Now, we are convinced, and this is the really important point, that the only way to hold securely what has been already won, is by advancing to our Modernist objective. It is only when we have reached that objective that our cause will have attained security and will possess the promise of permanence.

No doubt many Modernists will ask: What is our Modernist objective? Is it capable of definition? Is not our Modernist quest a never-ending pursuit of truth, goodness and beauty, the unfailing resolution to make the spirit of truth, freedom and love the dominating and increasingly prevailing spirit in the Christian Church?

Can we define such an objective? We can no more define it than we can, at this stage of our progress, fully comprehend it. It is an ever-growing vision beheld more clearly and fully as we advance from point to point. Generations of Modernists who

succeed us will we hope see this vision more clearly and will realize it in their Church spirit and practice and institutions more adequately than we can do, or even dream of now.

This is very true, and we have no desire to circumscribe Modernism by definitions. But the way to advance on the Modernist road is not merely by walking open-eyed with our gaze directed forward and upward. It also consists in the performance of definite necessary undertakings. It is not only the duty of the Modernist to see visions and to pursue those visions in his pilgrimage

'O'er moor and fen, o'er crag and torrent,'

but to make a road that those who come after may tread with security and assurance.

Although the English Modernist's objective cannot be defined, yet the tasks which it is his duty to accomplish in any particular situation in which he finds himself can be defined and should be defined in as concrete and practicable a fashion as possible. When we survey the Church of England and the spiritual state of the community to-day there are, so it must seem, six definite tasks to which we ought to address ourselves at the present time and to refuse to take any rest or feel any satisfaction until they have been achieved.

(1) First we must secure *intercommunion* among English Christians whatever the form of Christian Faith which they profess. The Holy Communion is the Sacrament of Christian Unity: the fellowship in the One Body of Christ: and the table at which the communicants partake is not the table of any particular sect of Christians, but the Table of the Lord. This is the sign and symbol of fundamental Christian fellowship. As a consequence, we are convinced that the Holy Communion in the English Church should be an 'open communion'—open to all who are communicants in every Christian body, be they Roman Catholics, or Plymouth Brethren, the wide world over. We know that there are some English Modernists who would be satisfied with what is called 'occasional communion.' Both the term and the thing seem to us to be objectionable. What we desire is that it should be normal and natural for Christians to whatever denomination they belong to take part in the service of Holy Communion whenever they are assembled for a reli-

gious purpose and that nobody's leave should be asked and nobody's permission should be given for such a proper proceeding. Of course we English Churchmen may not demand that the Holy Communion of other Christian bodies should be open to us, but there is no doubt that such would become the case except with the Roman Catholics and the Plymouth Brethren.

(2) This brings us to our second practical task. If the first task be the establishment of inter-communion, the second is the establishment of *inter-denominationalism.*

This second task goes naturally with the first. To-day members of the Church of England (presumably with the exception of His Majesty the King, who is also a communicant in the established Church of Scotland) are required to sign the following declaration before being enrolled as members of the Church of England in any particular parish :

> 'I am a member of the Church of England and do not belong to any religious body which is not in communion with the Church of England.'

Representations were made to the late Primate when the revised constitution of the Church of England was being drawn up urging him not to have the declaration of membership expressed in terms which necessarily precluded the person signing it from being also a member of any other Christian denomination. It was felt in view of the history of English Dissent and of the very close religious and social relations often existing between Dissenters and members of the National Church, that an exclusive declaration of membership of the Church of England should not be demanded. These recommendations were of course courteously received, but they were none the less ignored, although we doubt very much whether the late Primate himself was not in favour of a form of declaration of Church membership of a non-exclusive character. Happily there are many Christians in England who would be glad to be members of the Church of England if such membership did not mean severance from the particular denomination in which they were born and bred. But while recognizing that their own denomination has claims upon their gratitude and loyalty, these claims need not and indeed ought not to exclude the claim on them of the Church of England — the chief bulwark, notwithstanding all its defects,

of the Christian religion in this nation. It is certainly our task as Modernists to secure the removal of the negative clause from the form of declaration of Church membership — 'I do not belong to any body which is not in communion with the Church of England.'

(3) The third practical task is to secure a *free pulpit* in our cathedral and parish churches. By a free pulpit we mean the right of the parochial incumbent in the case of a parish pulpit and the cathedral authorities in the case of a cathedral pulpit to invite whomsoever they judge fit to preach sermons or deliver lectures and addresses in that pulpit either at liturgical or non-liturgical services and irrespective of whether such preachers or lecturers be ordained clergymen of the Church of England or of any other religious denomination or laymen or laywomen.

By securing this freedom for the pulpit in the Church of England we should enormously strengthen its power for good and give to the pulpit a moral, intellectual and spiritual authority — a power of attraction and of enlightenment which it is very far from possessing at present. It is essential in these days that the pulpit of the National Church should be a free pulpit and able to voice all that is most uplifting in the thought and aspiration of the nation.

It may be claimed that in putting forward this as a task to be achieved by Modernists, we seem to be unaware of the fact that this practice prevails widely at the present time. There is no doubt that it does exist but only, and that is our point, on sufferance. The practice is not legal and indeed is definitely prohibited by our Canons Ecclesiastical of 1604 as modified in the year 1865. At any moment the practice can be prohibited legally by the Diocesan Bishop, and quite possibly prohibited by him against his desire as the result of a legal protest and appeal made to him at the instance of some exclusive or reactionary Churchman. We desire to have the scandal of such protests rendered impossible, and this can only be done by having the ecclesiastical law on this point repealed or amended. There was a time, as we know, in English history when all books required a royal or episcopal licence for their publication. The removal of this restriction has been all to the good. And there is no reason to believe that the placing of the pulpits of cathedrals and

parish churches under the sole authority of the parochial and cathedral authorities would be detrimental to their proper moral and spiritual use.

(4) The fourth task which Modernists must accomplish is the securing of *simple declarations of Christian faith and practice* as alternatives to the ancient creeds at present prescribed. It is intolerable in the light of our modern ways of thinking produced by a vast extension both of historical and scientific knowledge, that many loyal and whole-hearted Christians and Churchmen should be required to profess their faith in forms which contain statements which in their minds are discredited by modern research, and which they cannot accept literally. Simple creeds which they could whole-heartedly affirm can easily be provided if only the Church authorities have the will to do it.

It cannot be emphasized too strongly that Modernists in demanding this as rightly due to them have no desire to preclude their fellow-church members of the traditionalist schools from affirming their Christian faith in the archaic forms. It is only as alternatives, optional alternatives, that Modernists demand the authorization by the Church authorities of simple modern creeds.

To the man who affirms the Virgin Birth or the Second Advent or the Resurrection of the Flesh, no injustice is done if his fellow-Churchman does not affirm his Christian faith in such a form as to include these things. If the Traditionalist should take the view that he has a right to demand that the Modern Churchman should make his declaration in the archaic form, then he is assuming a spiritual lordship over his brother which sins as much against the spirit of Christian freedom as against the spirit of Christian love. It is imperative that Modern Churchmen should bring this truth home to our Church authorities and secure from them this necessary and urgent reform.

(5) The fifth task of Modern Churchmen is to secure the authorization of *modern alternative services* for use at Baptism and Holy Communion.

Our authorized services of Baptism and Holy Communion of 1662 are definitely based upon dogmas and include references to them which the Modern Churchman does not and cannot

accept. For instance, the Modern Churchman in the case of Baptism does not believe in Original Sin and the guilt of Original Sin, nor that the Baptismal service does operate so as to purge those baptized of this guilt. Neither does the Modern Churchman believe that by the action of Baptism the individual baptized is actually made a child of God. He holds that he is already a child of God before his baptism and that baptism becomes for him the solemn declaration to him and to others of his Divine Sonship, and of the duties it entails and the privileges it confers.

To pass now to the Holy Communion. The Modern Churchman does not believe in the expiatory sacrifice of Christ and that His death ought to be commemorated and pleaded in the Holy Communion as a satisfaction for the sins of mankind. The doctrine of the Atonement held by Modernists certainly stresses the vicarious suffering of Christ, but not in the form of an expiatory offering. Yet it is plain that the expiatory doctrine of the Atonement is that expressed in our authorized Communion service. And of course it follows that the Modern Churchman in being restricted to the use of that form is compelled to affirm what he does not whole-heartedly believe. This is an intolerable position for many Modernists and it ought to be, if Christian love prevailed, even more intolerable for their fellow-Churchmen who are not Modernists.

We are often told that the Church of England has no definite and prescribed Doctrine of the Atonement: that in the long course of the Church's history the Doctrine of the Atonement has assumed a variety of forms, some of them contradictory of each other. But that no English Churchman is compelled to accept any one of these as his. Provided he believes in the atoning death of Christ he may explain to himself and to others that Atonement in the way which appeals most profoundly to his own moral, rational and spiritual consciousness. To refuse an alternative Holy Communion service to Modernists on the ground that the new service would most certainly not contain that expiatory view of the Atonement which is enshrined in our present service would be to insist that the Church of England has an official doctrine of the Atonement which it compels all its communicant members to affirm at every celebration of the Holy

Communion. Such a refusal, in an age which rightly demands the opposite policy, would certainly be to reduce the doctrinal limits of the Church of England.

(6) The sixth task of Modern Churchmen, and it is no less urgent than the five already named, is to take precautions *to preserve the existing relation between the Church and the State* in this land. We have reasons for believing that this relationship is in jeopardy. A demand for 'spiritual freedom' is being put forward, especially in Anglo-Catholic quarters, in a form which militates against the maintenance of the existing relationship of Church and State. Modern Churchmen can see no conflict between the claims of 'spiritual freedom' rightly understood and the maintenance of the existing relationship between the State and the Church.

The Modernist is compelled in the light of his study of Church History, and particularly the history of the Church of England, to hold that in the interests of the comprehensiveness of the Church and the preservation of the spiritual character of the State, that this age-long relationship between Church and State ought to be maintained. But since the Establishment, as it is called, is perhaps the most formidable barrier to ecclesiastical exclusiveness and sacerdotal tyranny on the one hand, and to the incorporation of the Church of England into the Church of Rome on the other, there are many who in the interest of these, as it must seem to us, detrimental policies, are seeking to overthrow the Establishment.

Modernists need to be alert in this matter and prepared with a policy which could be put forward should the worst befall. Such a policy should be framed so as to provide for the re-creation of the Church of England and its re-establishment on a broad-based foundation comprehending in its membership vast multitudes who are at present outside its communion, and devoting to the service of moral and spiritual religion in this land our cathedrals and parish churches and ancient endowments which a disestablished sect would have very properly forfeited as the result of its exclusiveness, sectarianism and mediaevalism.

Although, as we have said, this is not, judged from the diplomatic point of view, the most favourable of times for initiating a widespread and well-organized campaign for the carrying out

the six points of this policy, yet in the light of our fleeting opportunity it is essential that this campaign should be initiated at once. There is no need to suppose that merely the 1,200 members of the Modern Churchmen's Union and the few thousands more who attend their meetings would be even the main factor in this campaign if properly organized. We believe that the policy outlined would certainly gain the support of the whole Liberal Evangelical body and of a great multitude of Evangelicals who would not call themselves Liberal. We believe also that there are many Liberal Catholics who in the face of Romanist propaganda and mediaevalist obscurantism would give their support to such a policy for strengthening the influence of the religion of Christ in this land. These men are no warm supporters of the militant policy which the new Church Union will be pledged to carry out. They believe in the historic continuity of the Church and in the Apostolic Succession of the Christian Ministry: they believe in the celebration of the sacramental rites with the ancient ceremonial: they love the ancient formularies and use them with delight, but there is no reason to believe that on these accounts they are opposed to the enlargement of the doctrinal and liturgical boundaries of the Church of England, or that they would sin deliberately against Christian charity and Christian freedom by refusing to their fellow-Churchmen such reasonable reforms as we have advocated.

There is also a vast body of the English public, believers in a diffused, if not in a corporate, Christianity who would recognize readily the essential justice and reasonableness of the campaign which we advocate and would possibly, in case of necessity, throw their weight into the scales against its opponents. This applies also to large numbers of thoughtful and liberally-minded dissenters who are becoming more and more aware of the dangers which beset the influence of the Christian religion in this land both from the sides of superstition and of secularism and who recognize that the only way in which to defeat both these hostile forces is to strengthen and support that school and policy in the Church of England which, in no spirit of destructive intolerance, would both reform and enlarge the National Church and at the same time unite it in close bonds of fellowship with the Free Churches.

THE QUEST FOR REVELATION

By the Venerable W. M. Browne, M.A., Archdeacon of Rochester.

IN more than one movement in the Church to-day we are bidden to expect to find God in the irrational. The wisdom of man is to be scorned and rejected as a vain thing, yet by what other standard can we judge God's wisdom save by the kindly light of Reason?

To the question, 'Can a man by searching find out God?' St. Paul gives a positive answer when he says to the Athenians, 'He hath made of one blood all nations of men that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might find him, though He is not far from any of us.' Our Lord Himself seems to take for granted that the search for God is no hopeless quest, for He reiterates the message 'Seek and ye shall find,' and His invitation to His first disciples is 'Come and see.'

From one point of view revelation is the fruit of discovery, for without man's search and man's endeavour God could not reveal Himself : that is a lesson written throughout the pages of the Bible. There must be some approach to God on man's part if man is to receive what God has to give, just as truly as that man can only receive because God gives. But undoubtedly there is a fear in the minds of many believers that if we regard the prophets, for example, as men who declared the truth they had discovered — that they gave out just what they were able to receive and no more — we are thereby limiting the power of God and reducing the Divine Revelation to human limitations. Yet if we follow, as most of us do to-day, the view that the revelation in the Bible is a progressive revelation, we do certainly limit the scope of the vision of any one prophet.

Each prophet is a man of his own time and speaks his message primarily to the men of his own time, though as a prophet he must be essentially a man of forward-looking thoughts, and no doubt he will be better understood by those who come after him than by his own generation. His insight into the moral conditions of his own day will give him foresight as to the future events of the course of history. Then, you will say, that implies

that the message of the prophet is limited to what he was able to discern through his own moral and mental standards, that he was a discoverer, and therefore what he discovered about God was limited by his environment and capacity for receiving the things of God. That, I think, is the truth, but not the whole truth : that is how the problem appears to us from the human point of view, and we cannot but look at the events of history, whether within the Bible or outside, from our standpoint as men.

Then, you will say, all revelation is of man, and not of God. To that I reply, though it must be of man, it does not necessarily rule out the possibility of it being of God also. Revelation is discovery—discovery, I say, not invention, and the use of one or other of those words makes all the difference. To say, as some do, that so-called revelation is an invention of man is to affirm that in the Christian Faith we are following cunningly devised fables and not the truth. But the truth cannot be revealed unless it is discovered, and the word discovery may warn us that revelation is given according to the measure of faith, and that our religious knowledge is partial. 'We know in part and we prophesy in part,' says St. Paul; but none the less discovery may be a true revelation from God.

Let us take an example of the distinction which I wish to draw, for it is vital to our subject. Adam the astronomer, by mathematical calculations in his study, determines that there must be a planet in a certain position in the universe to account for certain movements of the heavenly bodies. A sceptical critic may assert that it is all an invention on his part and proves nothing. But Adam proves his hypothesis to be correct by means of his telescope—'for this watcher of the skies a new planet swims into his ken'—and Adam's name goes down to posterity as the discoverer of the planet Neptune. He didn't invent the planet; he didn't make it; the planet, unknown and unnamed, was there from its creation.

As believers in God we must believe that the discovery, as we call it, by the astronomer was according to the will of God, that it was a revelation given to one who had prepared himself to receive it in the time appointed. The discovery was given, the object of man's search was revealed, and the revelation accounted for the facts that had hitherto been unexplained.

If we apply the same analogy to the revelation in the Bible, we are not reducing God's revelation to the level of man's thoughts about God—though we owe a debt to the philosophers of Greece as well as to the prophets of Israel—but we are pointing out that man, by following the light that is in him, will find the source of light in God. Because I cannot see the sun unless my eyes are capable of receiving light, it does not mean that my idea of the sun is purely subjective. The sun is the object of my physical sight; so, too, it is in God's light that we see light.

We know well enough that the so-called discoveries of science are not made by chance; they are the fruit of long research and high endeavour. But even these achievements have in them an element of the 'given.' The language used of success in working out a problem suggests that the solution 'came'; it suddenly flashed upon the mind that such and such a course of experiment might lead to success, and it did; but it came to a mind prepared. The same experience is true in art. The vision of the beautiful is given, though more is given to the artist than even he can achieve, and to see the full beauty of the masterpiece of painting requires a trained taste and a discerning eye. To the critic of his painting who said that he had never seen a sunset like that, Turner answered, 'No, and don't you wish you could.' The reply was a rebuke.

So, too, in the spiritual and moral realm it is the pure in heart who see God. There must be some sense of the good to appreciate the good. The spirit of prophecy must be in the disciple to appreciate the prophet's message. 'He that receiveth a prophet, because he is a prophet, shall receive a prophet's reward.' The same principle is shown us in our Lord's visit to Nazareth. He could there do no mighty work because of their unbelief. Both Christ and St. Paul quote the hard saying of the prophet, 'that seeing they may see and not perceive, and hearing they may hear and not understand, lest haply they should turn again and it should be forgiven them.' It is not enough that there should be in man the potentiality of the things of God; there must be the response of faith to receive the gifts of grace.

When we consider the question of revelation, there cannot but be consideration of the kind of revelation that we might expect of God. Man cannot rid himself of the position of being in

a sense a judge of the quality of the revelation that speaks to him in the name of God. Revelation, if it is to be accepted as true, must be reasonable; it must be understandable by man, and to be understandable it must be adapted to human conditions. Thus our Lord made His appeal to man as man. He gave His revelation in the language of His day: it was above man's level, but not beyond his grasp. It is therefore possible in reading the Bible to see how man discovered more and more about God, and the more he discovered the more God was able to give, for with what measure we mete it is measured to us again. Too often we are content to go to God with the mere thimble of our own desire, when He wishes to give us of His fullness.

Whether we rely on the infallibility of God speaking in the Bible, or the infallibility of the Church, the point which decides whether we hear that voice or not is determined by our own decision to accept the oracle in the first place, quite apart from our reading our own interpretation into what is written in the Scriptures or what is spoken by the Church. Even if, with the followers of Karl Barth, we insist on the inability of man to reach God, even if we deny any progressive line of revelation and belief that the Word of God is given directly downward from above, still there is the question of 'What is it that is given?' Barth, the preacher in the line of Calvin, seems to pick and choose his texts by which he declares God's Word. We are often told to remember that behind the preacher is a profound scholar and a ruthless critic of the New Testament. We are bidden to remember that we are listening to one of the foremost scholars of Germany; but are we not asked to forget his work in the study, that we may bow before his force in the pulpit? We may prefer the avowed intellectual agnosticism of Dean Mansel, whose Bampton Lectures are still a standard for the rationalistic sceptic who feels bound to affirm 'I do not understand in order that I may believe.'

But surely the truth about reason and revelation is that Reason goes out into the unknown to find that God is there to answer the need of the true seeker by Revelation. You cannot believe without thinking, though the scholar saints of the Church can go further than that and say you cannot think without believing.

But to leave the first principles of faith which we believe to underlie the possibility of revelation, to consider the content of revelation. I know it will be said, is not the truth of revelation confirmed to us by miracle, for the miracles of the Bible are again and again used to prove that its message must be true. The history of miracle in the Bible requires study. If we look at the Old Testament the miraculous element is confined to the early theophanies of God, to the traditional writings. When we come to the prophets, there is the cycle of miracles associated with the stories of Elijah and Elisha; but Amos, Isaiah and Jeremiah do not call down fire from heaven to prove the truth of their words, and it is to these prophets that writers like Bishop Gore turn to prove the truth of God's revelation to man through the Hebrew race.

When we turn to the miracles of Jesus, one thing is very noticeable: He did not consider them as the primary evidence of the truth of His message. They were suggestive rather than compelling; in fact, He deprecated the acceptance of His message on the grounds of His signs alone, and we have His own authority for saying that even should a man rise from the dead, that in itself would not be enough to call forth the kind of faith that He sought. During the last year of His ministry, according to the Marcan account, when His disciples had recognized in Him the promised Christ, miracles play a minor part in the story.

But, you will say, surely there is one great exception to this reading of the Gospel, even if we accept it so far, and that is the Resurrection. True enough; I have said nothing to deny the truth of the miracles, though I would recognize some discrimination in accepting the detailed accounts given in the Gospels. With God all things are possible, but all things are not expedient. A miracle to compel belief was never God's way, though it was the devil's temptation. The Resurrection was never used to compel the men of Jerusalem to recognize, in the forsaken Prophet of Galilee, the Prince of Life: it was only those who were prepared by their own seeking, by their own devotion, by their own loving sorrow, that were chosen to be witnesses of the Risen Lord. The Master revealed Himself to those who were chosen; He was seen of those who felt their need of Him, and even to these He said 'blessed are they who have not seen and yet have believed.'

Revelation is still by the way of discovery; it is a revelation of what eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, for revelation is the unveiling, the dis-covering, of truth that is not man made but God given.

If my thesis is right, namely, that revelation is by discovery, in what way does this affect our faith in the Christian message, and does it help us to commend our faith to others?

Firstly, by this way of approach to the historic revelation in the Bible, we rid ourselves of those difficulties that are inherent in any doctrine of the infallibility of the Scriptures, which has, I think, been not only completely disproved by those who have the right to be called biblical scholars, but has also been shown to be an antiquated weapon that is useless in the defence of the faith — a positive hindrance to living discipleship in the world to-day. Even its champions to-day have to adopt impossible readings into the meaning of the Scripture to defend it.

Secondly, the view that revelation is by the way of discovery makes room for progressive revelation, not only in the first four centuries — that period of time which the Catholic Church must include within the period of true revelation, if we are to recognize the Divine origin of our creeds — but also in the centuries that intervene between the last Oecumenical council and our own day. The period of the Reformation was not devoid of Divine guidance and revelation for those who loyally accept the historic position of the Anglican communion. The revival of missionary work in the last two centuries is proof enough of the revelation given to the Church of God of all communions by those who were pioneers of missionary enterprise and discovered new fields for Christian endeavour, and new methods of using the power of the Spirit to overthrow the strongholds of Satan.

We cannot limit the revelation of God to certain centuries, or to certain schools of Christian thought and Church order. We owe too much to the Roman Communion, and to the Society of Friends, to be content merely to say that they have erred, without recognizing the increased knowledge of God that has been given to us by their leaders and saints.

If revelation is progressive—and which of us would dare to affirm that God's truth was limited to the first three centuries, or to the golden age of a uniform Church, or to claim that our faith

was the faith of the Reformers? — does it not follow that revelation is by the way of discovery? Not that all that was claimed to be true by one set of discoveries really had the value of revelation, but fresh discoveries have brought us a wider vision and shown us the steps by which progress in the knowledge of God was made.

The revelation in the Bible has been made clearer and shown in its true proportions by the revelation of History. God did not have one way of educating His people of the old Covenant, and an entirely new way of training the Christian Church. If He spoke in times past by the prophets and the fathers, He none the less speaks with no uncertain voice by His messengers in the world to-day. If God called Samuel in Shiloh, He no less truly called Francis at Assissi, and Wesley at Oxford, and Livingstone in Glasgow. The form may have changed, but the message was the same sure word of God. It is the God of our fathers who speaks to us yet and calls us to new ventures for Christ.

Lastly, how does the view of revelation as discovery help us in our own experience? The appeal of the Christian faith to-day is to 'experience.' Even those who claim to speak for an infallible Book, or for an infallible Church, not very logically make their final appeal to experience. The appeal is sometimes made to the experience of the group, the society, the Church, but more often to the experience of the individual. We cannot but in fairness recognize that 'conversion' is an experience common to all communions, and, in fact, common to faiths other than Christian.

A vivid definite experience which we can perhaps date in our own lives as a turning-point was real enough to make us feel and know that God had spoken; but conversions are starting places for new ventures of faith, not stopping places where we are meant to remain. The true value of conversion is that it starts us on our way, and, looking back at it, we learn its meaning and see it as a stage in our pilgrim's progress.

The ecstatic vision is not always the vision to which we owe the most. 'I knew a man in Christ,' says St. Paul, and he is no doubt referring to himself, 'who was caught up into paradise.' But of such an experience he does not wish to boast; he would rather speak of his infirmities.

Revelation when it is given shows us a path of duty to follow; it is only by following the path that one can discover more. We are led from the mountain-top to the valley, from vision to service; for vision is not the goal of faith, but the impetus to self-sacrificing service. 'Add to your faith virtue, and to virtue knowledge, and to knowledge temperance, and to temperance patience, and to patience godliness, and to godliness brotherly kindness, and to brotherly kindness charity.' These are the milestones on the Way, the way trodden by the Master, the way of patient discovery and humble duties.

The light from heaven is not the blinding flash, but the light we discover on the path of duty, that leads us on in growth of character step by step, by prayer, devotion and communion. It is seen most clearly not in the revelations vouchsafed to the Seer of Patmos, but in the old disciple carried into the gathering of Christians to repeat the message he had from the beginning, 'Little children, love one another.'

Faith in Christ reveals a new way of life, a new quality of life, which we can only discover to be true by following step by step. The Christian's progress must be by growth in character: there is no short cut to the Kingdom of Heaven. The revelation that has been given to us is a revelation fitted to human conditions; it is by the way of dis-covery rather than by the way of direct vision.

THE AUTHORITY OF TRADITION AND THE AUTHORITY OF PERSONAL EXPERIENCE

AN AMERICAN VIEW *

By Wilbur L. Caswell.

WHILE no doubt in the ideal Church, tradition and personal opinion, the priest and the prophet, the formulated creed and the adventure of faith should supplement each other, they seem in most cases to be not only rivals but enemies. It is difficult for us to think of them in any other way. As we

* A paper read at the Chicago Church Congress and published in a volume entitled *Chicago Papers* (Heffernan Press).

consider the relative authority of tradition and personal religious experience, there are three propositions which seem to be evident.

(1) We cannot set tradition over against individual experience as if there were somehow a mysterious 'Mind of the Church' quite different from, and superior to, the mind of the individual. Personal experience and personal opinion are the only sort there are.

(2) A theological creed, tradition, or dogma, though it may intend to formulate, and thus to perpetuate, the religious experience of the Saints, often thwarts and deadens spiritual life, rather than stimulates it.

(3) There is little dependable relation between what we commonly call a man's religious beliefs, and his fundamental religious self.

First, what is, if any, the fundamental distinction between a faith wrought out of the personal experience of a Saint and the so-called 'Voice of the Church'? I am aware that there is a psychology of the crowd, and that the power of a group is greater than the sum of its separate parts. Peter plus John plus James includes also Peter raised to the Johnth power and Peter raised to the Jamesth power, and Peter raised to the John—Jamesth power. But it is still Peter, Peter inspired, irritated, embittered, modified, converted, as the case may be, by his association with the others. No one but a lunatic would attempt to manage his life or formulate his theorics regardless of the best that has been thought and done in the past. And no experience is Christian that is not a social experience of sacrificial service.

But do we not sometimes fall into the snare of using Paul's magnificent figure of the Body, of which we are members, as if it were a biological statement, and not a figure of speech? In the physical body the cells must die that the whole body may live. But the cells and organs of the social body are personalities which must be preserved. The preservation and enrichment of these personalities, the Christian believes, is what chiefly interests God. Our Soviet friends talk sometimes as if they were starving their personal private stomachs for the benefit of some mystic Social Stomach. But of course they are sacrificing im-

mediate food, clothing, housing, leisure, for individuals in the future; for it is only individuals who can wear clothes, eat food, or live in houses. We cannot clothe, feed, or house the State.

And it is only the individual mind which can think, and only the individual person who can have a religious experience. The 'Mind of the Church' is simply the resultant of the activities of all the minds that can get a hearing. The opinion of a church council or a Lausanne Conference, for instance, is usually one of three things. It may be, on rare occasions, that in the end all the delegates are converted to the same view. Then we have an individual opinion which has become general. Or the majority, or perhaps ('to make it unanimous') everyone, may vote for an opinion which is the best they can hope to get. But this compromise is hardly an opinion at all, because it adequately expresses the view of no one. It is like a composite photograph, which is a portrait of no living being. Finally, and this is most likely, the final statement may be put in terms so general that everyone agrees to it, in which case it is not an opinion, but twenty or thirty, or a hundred different opinions, all put in the same words. 'I believe in God' is such a statement.

There are those, of course, who devoutly believe that, however weak the mental or spiritual faculties of individuals, whenever the whole Church speaks in council assembled, she is by special miracle endowed with divine infallibility. Of course this is not the view of the Anglican Communion, and is explicitly contradicted in the famous sentence in the XXXIX Articles: 'General Councils may err, and have erred even in things pertaining to God.' Nevertheless there are some, and this includes all members of the Roman Church, who are able to believe that General Councils are infallible, which is indeed an amazing conclusion in the light of their history. The methods of the Councils and their final decisions provide little reason to believe that they possessed a corporate wisdom with a more divine sanction than that of individual members. The decision of a crowd tends to fall to the level of its lowest, rather than to rise to that of its highest, mind.

The Church's tradition is usually the personal conviction of an outstanding genius who has persuaded his fellow-Christians that he has received a revelation from God. But there is no

experience but a personal experience, and no opinion but a personal opinion. That is what the word *opinion* means. The Roman Catholic Church forbids private judgment, but what other sort is there? I may refuse to judge, because of ignorance or lack of interest, and I may repeat words that have no meaning to me, but all this is not religious belief. I contend then, in the first place, that there is no 'Mind of the Church' which towers above the individual mind in solemn sublimity, a sacrosanct oracle to which the individual must yield his own judgment.

Secondly, religious tradition usually thwarts and strangles faith rather than stimulates it. Tradition attempts to formulate the experience of brave explorers. But reading the history of these daring exploits is not much like fighting the battles for myself. Theology is much like English grammar. I do not believe that anyone has ever learned to speak correct English by memorizing rules or parsing sentences. A boy brought up in the slums might learn to speak properly if he fell in love with a girl from Boston or wanted to sell automobiles or vacuum cleaners to college professors and their wives. Grammar is an interesting *post-mortem* analysis for those who have already learned to speak by experience. And many of our creeds and dogmas might best serve as the fire-side reminiscences of weathered veterans of the faith who have already fought a good fight.

Not only do our theological formulations and standardizations of past experience prove ineffective in stimulating or inspiring fresh experience, they have a tendency actually to suppress it. Theology might be called the obituary of the saints. Browning makes Bishop Blougram speak of

> Greek endings, and the little passing-bell
> That signifies some faith's about to die.

The poet is thinking of new science that destroys old creeds. But his words might be applied to the dogmas which proclaim the death of flaming ideals. The *ologies* of tradition are largely inscriptions on the tombs of the saints whose bones fill Joseph Parker's 'commodious cemetery over whose portals is written *It hath been said by them of old time*.' A great conviction pours forth like molten metal from a fiery furnace of rebellious faith, but it is soon cooled, and welded into a chain and a sword to bind and to coerce the future.

This has ever been the tragic paradox of religion. We believe that any ideal, to become effective, must be in some way organized and formulated. But then it begins to lose its zest and vitality. To-day's battle cry of freedom becomes to-morrow's slogan of oppression. The bold modernism of the Nicene Creed, which integrates the thought of the Fourth Century Christian, becomes a permanent incubus which prevents creative religious thought in an age with a quite different philosophy. Thomas Aquinas so successfully creates a brand-new system of theology and ethics, that his discoveries become for seven hundred years a barrier to the thought of the Roman Catholic. The 'Daughters of the American Revolution' are most intolerant of any radical opinion. Do we commend our Gospel to the world by imbedding its pulsating life beneath a thick crust of tradition?

Tradition builds the tombs of the dead prophets, but in the process of construction casts all the spare rocks it can find at the prophets who still live. It will permit no new recruits to enlist in the regiment of the faith till they have been decked out in the grave-clothes of deceased heroes. Is not this what credal conformity usually implies? We cannot hope for a Church composed entirely of flaming rebels and inspired geniuses. I think it is Kirsopp Lake who has said that a Church with no prophets would die of paralysis, and one with nothing but prophets would die of convulsions. Most of us must follow humbly the prophets of our choice. But these living souls, not merely the ecclesiastical attempts to explain the dead ones, must be our chief source of authority.

Finally, the Church has too often thought of its tradition as a set of purely intellectual opinions. The outlines of orthodox requirements have shifted widely, but there have usually been certain specific propositions which every Christian is under obligation to accept. It is strange that Jesus seems to have had little interest in that sort of belief. To him, as to St. Paul, faith meant a life of dependence upon God, a fellowship with Him, and a partnership in His great task. Faith, as has been well said, is 'not belief in spite of evidence, but life in scorn of consequence.' Neither Jesus nor Paul could be called systematic theologians. But the Church has persistently pictured the Last Judgment as if it were a sort of college-entrance examination,

and it asks even the baby to believe all the articles of the Christian faith.

For many generations there have been saints wise enough to suspect that what a man professes to believe about God may have little relation to his real and ultimate self. Jesus warned us, 'Not every one that saith unto me, "Lord, Lord," shall enter into the kingdom of heaven.' And if He had been at Nicaea, He might have said with even deeper conviction, 'Not everyone that saith of me, "Very God of very God," knows what the kingdom of heaven is.'

We have usually regarded the inconsistency between creed and practice as a startling paradox, but the experiments of psychological research — concerned with concrete exhibitions of human conduct which may be measured by more than pious surmise—these experiments all point in one direction, to the lack of any dependable relation between what is commonly called theological belief and essential character. And is not history full of such contradictions? The Calvinist, with his predestination, ought to have been a fatalist, but he has been the most persistent reformer the world has ever seen. With his celestial Tsar, he should have been a monarchist, but he has always stood for democracy and human rights. His scorn of good works should have made him an antinomian, but he was always far more fussy over his habits than the Roman Catholic who believed that good works might help him to Paradise. Many a village atheist loved God too much to believe in Him, that is, he was too full of the love of God to accept the only God on the horizon. If the choice were, as it seemed to be, between the God of Jonathan Edwards and no God at all, like a true Christian, he chose no God at all. There died in New York last spring a great Jew who was truly an 'unconscious follower of Jesus,' Dr. Felix Adler of the Ethical Culture Society, and our own Church still mourns one of her most winsome prophets who lured many to the way of Jesus without having any theology at all — Robert Norwood.

Could anyone seriously maintain that those who have been most conspicuous for a whole-souled devotion to the spirit and plan of Jesus have been the most loyal in their interpretation of the Nicene Christology? One could present a fairly plausible case for the precise opposite. We all know Unitarians who shame

us by their devotion to the principles of Jesus, and we know of meticulous orthodoxy which is obviously little more than an escape-mechanism for those who wish to dodge the burden of being Christians. The typical idea of Christian faith even now confines itself largely to theories and the outer cortex of the soul.

Far down beneath what we say lies what we do, and down beneath what we do is what we essentially are. The first seems to be irrelevant to anything but our intellectual furniture. The other two are closely akin. What I do and what I am are of the same colour, but not yet of the same tint. Or they are looking in the same direction, and some day will be one. I suppose it was of the last realm of the soul that Paul was thinking when he said that we are saved by faith, not works; by attitude, not complete accomplishments; not by immunity from sin, but by the direction in which we look when we arise from our fall.

But has this a great deal to do with the intellectual twists of the mind? Henry Drummond compared the conventional evangelical of his day, saved by a theory of the Atonement, to the hermit-crab. Such a believer was a parasite who had 'crept into the convolutions of a syllogism.' And there are still some who find great religious merit in the acceptance of certain theological statements, and great sin in the rejection of them. One sometimes wonders whether the phrases 'God is one,' or 'God is three,' or 'Christ is chiefly man,' or 'Christ is chiefly God' (we are remarkably sure of ourselves for beings who really do not know what either God or man is), or 'I believe that God is in the making,' or 'I believe that God is a Person,' or 'I believe that God is a Purpose,' do not reflect rather religious dialect than fundamental religious differences. Such views ought to affect deeply our whole religious attitude, but they do not. We all know humanists who maintain the fundamental values of theism far more successfully than many of us, and agnostics with a more sublime faith in the dependability of the universe and the essential goodness of things. In his play, *The Pigeon*, Galsworthy made Mrs. Meighan say, 'Me 'usband's a Catholic, also a hatheist.' Which, alas, is not as ridiculous as it sounds.

The Christian Scientists, the Friends and the Roman Catholics do seem to present an exception to this generalization. They do, on the whole, practise their creeds. But they constitute one of

those exceptions which, unlike most exceptions, actually does prove the rule. Their faith is not so much a theological theory as a way of acting, in the case of the Christian Scientist an attitude toward disease, of the Friend an attitude toward war, and of the Roman Catholic a devotion to ritual acts and a not too exacting morality.

If we must have some sort of standard by which to gauge the status of Christians—and why must we?—it should be one which attempts to set forth the attitude of the soul rather than to explain the faith in terms of the blue-print and a chemical formula. The creeds should be battle-songs to set up marching, pitched in so high a spiritual key that the timid who fear adventure will drop out of the procession. They should attempt to express the attitude of the whole man toward fundamental realities.

It has been suggested that the Church should provide a variety of alternative creeds, for those with differing Christian convictions, and for any of us in our different moods. We might sometimes use Dr. Major's creed from the writings of St. John, sometimes that recently published — I believe in the *Modern Churchman* — extracted from the Epistles of St. Paul by the Rev. E. P. Boys-Smith, and why not now and then the famous Unitarian creed, 'I believe in the fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man, and progress of the human race onward and upward for ever'? If we need philosophical affirmations they should surely be in terms congenial to our own thought. The Logos doctrine after all is no more divine than the theory of evolution. But the creeds ought if possible to be, not guide-books for a safe visit to a museum or even for a motor trip down the main highway, but a challenge to those who must 'blaze' their own trails through the jungle of human experience.

Have we any right to demand any more from the Christian than his faith that there is an underlying purpose effective in the universe, and that this purpose is best revealed in the life and teachings of Jesus, to which he vows to give himself in whole-hearted devotion? If this seems a pallid and anaemic creed, I need only remind you that few of us have yet attained unto it. And if you ask me what would become of a Church that made no more rigid requirements of its members, I must remind you that practically we all belong to such a Church. We know both clergy

and laity who are, so far as theory goes, theists, humanists, semi-theists, Trinitarians, Unitarians, tri-theists, Spiritualists, Theosophists, and Christian Scientists. But they are united or divided on a deeper level — their essential attitude towards the universe and towards man.

Saint Paul seems to have been the first Christian to understand Jesus, and we sometimes fear he was the last. We are almost shocked at his unconcern over the past life of Jesus in Palestine, so devoted was he to 'the Christ that is to be.' And Jesus would not limit His Kingdom by any clear-cut definition or unite with any of the established parties which offered definite plans for its attainment. He refused to build an aqueduct for the Spirit of God. Perhaps Clutton-Brock was right in his bold assertion that no one, not Jesus Himself, would venture to predict what the Kingdom might become till it had been tried.

We can best recapture the spirit of the early Church by never forgetting that, as the Archbishop of York has told us, we are the early Church. The Church has a glorious past, and an unpredictable future. It is dead unless it is willing to follow the Master wherever He may lead. Gerald Stanley Lee says that the Christian Church should be a 'Hallelujah Laboratory'; not a mere conserver of ancient documents, but an experiment station for those who in every conceivable way are exploring the possibilities of religion and life, in search of new adventures in the love of God and man. No tradition can be valid till it has found its sanction where alone it can find it, in my own personal experience, guided and directed by the experience of better saints than myself, and always in fellowship with the Living Christ. There is a so-called faith which is content with a correct recitation of a history-lesson, but religion begins only with a sincere personal friendship, and there is no Christianity without a continually deepening fellowship with the living Lord.

THE TROUBLES IN FRANKFORT AND THE MARIAN EXILES IN GENEVA

THE judicious monograph of Docteur C. Martin,* published in 1915, is of great interest and great value to students who, following the development of the Reformation in England, desire also details of the happenings of our exiles abroad during the Marian persecution. He traces in this work the origin of the church of the English founded in Geneva to the troubles in the church of the English founded in Frankfort, which in their turn had their innocent beginning in the church of the Walloon weavers which had been at Glastonbury.

The will of Henry VIII shows that, whatever his motive, he had in mind a progress towards a real reformation of the Church. His sympathies had already been evident by the men to whom he entrusted the education of his son; further, Gardiner was not appointed to the Council of Regency. The appalling ignorance of the clergy—in Hooper's diocese, of 311 priests 27 were ignorant of the origin of the Lord's Prayer, 170 could not repeat the Ten Commandments—led Cranmer to invite from abroad theologians, such as Bucer and Peter Martyr, to instruct ordinands for the new Church. Of special interest, with reference to the future colony in Geneva, was the establishment of churches for the foreign refugees to England. a Lasco of Poland, having fled from Emden in Frisia, where he had founded a reformed church, was appointed by Edward in 1550, with four pastors under him, head of the Flemish, Walloon, Dutch and German congregations in London. The royal decree commands the Lord Mayor, the Bishop of London and all our other clergy to permit the Superintendent and his clergy freely and quietly to enjoy and practise their own rites, ceremonies and discipline, although they do not conform with those in use in our kingdom. a Lasco, writing to the King of Poland, states that King Edward had told him he hoped that, encouraged by

* *Les Protestants Anglais réfugiés à Genève au temps de Calvin*, 1555—1560. Par Charles Martin, Docteur en théologie, ancien pasteur à Genève.

this example, the English Churches would, with the unanimous consent of the Estates of the Realm, be moved to embrace the Gospel in its purity. In the same light we must consider the founding under Valérand Poullain, on the model[1] laid down by Calvin at Strassburg, of the church at Glastonbury for the Walloon weavers, who, like a Lasco's church, were given complete independence of English forms and of the bishops. There can be no doubt that Edward and Cranmer intended that these communities should serve for guidance in the gradual progress in England towards a new form of Protestant Church.

On coming to the throne in 1553, Mary promised a toleration which was not observed. The reforming bishops were deposed soon after, and several were imprisonerd. The privileges of the foreign communities were withdrawn. In December, a Lasco and 175 of his German and Flemish followers embarked for Denmark: repulsed thence, and from Hamburg and Bremen, they found a home once more at Emden. Peter Martyr went back to Strassburg, and among those with him went Grindal, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, and Sandys, later Archbishop of York. The renown of Bullinger drew another group to Zürich, where they found shelter in a house belonging to Froschower, the printer and humanist. These included L. Humphrey, afterwards President of Magdalen and Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, and then Dean of Winchester; Jewel, later Bishop of Salisbury; Parkhurst, later Bishop of Norwich; Pilkington, later Bishop of Durham; Bentham, later Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry; Horne, later Bishop of Winchester; Lever, already Master of St. John's, Cambridge; and W. Cole, later President of Corpus Christi and Dean of Lincoln. On the death of Pellikan, Peter Martyr left Strassburg to become Professor of Hebrew in Zürich. Sandys followed him. Thus were formed two sister English churches at Zürich and at Strassburg, to which we must now add the church of Frankfort.

Poullain and his weavers were expelled from England early in 1554. From Emden they went to Cologne, and thence to Frankfort, where they were well received in spite of the

[1] A translation of the form of common prayers, ministration of the sacraments and Calvin's catechism was printed in England in 1550.

L'ordre des prières et ministère ecclesiastique . . . et la confession de Foy de l'Eglise de Glastonbury en Somerset (London, 1552).

Lutheran, and the fear they might be like the Anabaptists, whose notorious excesses in Münster were not forgotten. To reassure the Senate, Poullain laid before them the liturgy he used at Glastonbury, and a confession of faith[2] was signed by the elders of his Walloon church. This was also signed on behalf of their countrymen by four Englishmen, including William Whitingham; for by June, 1554, some two hundred English had arrived. These were allowed to share with the Walloons the Weissfrauenkirche, on the condition that they adhered to the same doctrine and profession of faith.

Thus was founded the church of the English in Frankfort, the troubles in which led to the founding of the English church in Geneva. Happy at their welcome, the Frankfort exiles invited their countrymen in Emden, Wesel, Strassburg and Zürich to join them in founding a Church which should be an example when the day of persecution was over. The reply was disappointing. The Zürich 'students,' as they called themselves, considered they had a right to pursue their studies, which would be as useful to the church, when re-established in England, as the organization of the church in Frankfort. They would come to Frankfort to try to reach an understanding on condition they could be sure of worshipping in accordance with the service accepted recently in England, for they were firmly decided to employ no other. The negotiations led to no result. The Zürich and Strassburg refugees felt it would be a weakening of the English character of the church and a treason to renounce the Prayer Book of Edward VI for which their brethren in England were in prison. The Frankfort people felt that to adhere entirely to that Prayer Book was to abandon the progress which Edward and his counsellors would have realized if they could.

By now John Knox was pastor of the church in Frankfort, and after consulting Calvin, before whom the English Prayer Book was laid in no favourable light in a Latin outline, he, Whitingham and others drew up a liturgy which became later, with few modifications, that of the church of the English in Geneva, and then that of the Church of Scotland. It pleased a large number of the congregation, but those who leaned to the

[2] Liturgia sacra, seu ritus Ministerii in ecclesia peregrinorum Francofordiae ad Moenum. Addita est summa doctrinae seu fidei professio ejusdem Ecclesiae.—Printed at Frankfort, 1554.

English book could not accept it. On his knees Anthony Gilby implored them not to separate, and as a last concession Knox and Whitingham collaborated with the Anglicans, as we may almost call them, to write a Liturgy of Compromise. A trial was to be made of this, and once more a joyful communion was celebrated.

Knox had thus far shown some moderation, but in March, 1555, new refugees arrived from England. At their head was Dr. Cox, who had been tutor of Edward VI and Chancellor of Oxford University. He was definitely Protestant, but not less definitely Anglican. He was determined that things should be as in England, and he and his followers disturbed the services. As they had been accepted as members of the church, Knox and his party were now in a minority.[3] The tragedy began, as Knox himself said, and consultation ceased. Cox was dogmatic and overbearing, and was supported by the *élite* of the English in Zürich and Strassburg. Knox, for his part, could not retreat nor concede more without abandoning the principles which guided him. Indeed, he maintained that God was afflicting England because of her indifference to reform when she had had the opportunity. In this rupture appeal was made to the civil power. The followers of Knox reminded the Senate of the conditions under which they were permitted to settle and to enjoy the use of a church. The Senate concurred and required the use of the liturgy of Poullain and Calvin. Thereupon the adversaries denounced a writing of Knox in which, the year before, he had attacked Philip and Mary, and Charles V himself. The Senate were seriously alarmed, for Frankfort was part of the German Empire, and they requested Knox to leave not only Frankfort, but Germany.

This, however, did not end the schism. The Anglicans, having gained permission to use the English Book, were still opposed by Knox's adherents — chiefly Whitingham, Gilby,

[3] 'A Brieff discours off the troubles begonne at Franckford in Germany Anno Domini 1554. Abowte the Booke off common prayer and Ceremonies, and continued by the Englishe men theyre to thende off Q. Maries Raigne, in the which discours the gentle reader shall see the very originall and beginninge off all the contention that hathe byn, and what was the cause off the same. Marc 4.'

Without name or place of author (attributed to Whitingham), or printer, in the British Museum.

Williams, W. Cole, Foxe, Kethe and Goodman, all men of importance later—who refused to comply with the majority and asked leave to join some other church, probably that of Poullain; a request which was declined. Whitingham had ascertained already that his friends would be welcomed in Basel or Geneva. A few, among them Foxe, of the 'Book of Martyrs,' proceeded to Basel, where he worked as a reader in the printing office of Oporinus, but the greater number arrived in Geneva on the 13th October, 1555, and were welcomed with courtesy by the people, the clergy and the magistrates. Calvin reminded the Council that formerly England had granted churches to foreigners, and asked that now a building might be granted to these in their exile.

Le Livre des Anglois—presented to the Genevese when the colony broke up, and preserved in the Geneva State archives—records that this group constituted themselves into a church on the 1st November, 1555. In the absence of Knox, who was then at Dieppe, Anthony Gilby and Christopher Goodman were appointed provisional ministers, and the Council decreed that they should share with the Italian community the Church of Nostre Dame la Nove, close to the Cathedral of St. Pierre.

The congregation at this date numbered twenty English already living in Geneva, and the twenty-seven who arrived in October. From this time on till 1559 there were 132 more, and with some few whose names are on the *Genevese Registre des Habitants* only, there may have been 186, subject to later loss and increase through deaths and births.[4] It is curious that the name of Miles Coverdale does not appear, though he was made an elder of the church and was godfather to Knox's son. There can be little doubt that he took part in the translation of the Geneva Bible. It is curious, too, that some fifty of those named in the *Livre des Anglois* do not appear in the *Registre des Habitants*; possibly because it was not known whether they meant to remain in the city.[5]

[4] Not one Anglo-Genevese marriage is recorded.

[5] Rouland Hall, for instance, the printer of 'the breeches' or Geneva Bible, is entered in the *Livre des Anglois* as arriving in the early half of 1556. Whereas in the *Registre des Habitants* he and some fifty others are not entered until October, 1557. On returning to England, Hall adopted the arms of Geneva, the half-eagle and key, as the sign of his press, with the Genevese device, 'post tenebras lux.'

The leaders of the church have been named above. Outlines of their lives may be found in the *Dictionary of National Biography*. Of William Whitingham, a learned layman and aristocrat, we may mention here that a contemporary writes that, in view of the absences of Knox, he was urged by Calvin to become a pastor; and that he was a chief collaborator in the translation of the Bible.

Of high standing was Sir William Stafford, who before October, 1555, had settled in Geneva with his wife and children, her sister, a cousin and five servants. His first wife had been sister to Anne Boleyn, and as the favour he had formerly enjoyed at Court incurred the ill-will of Mary, he went abroad. He was a generous supporter of the English church. He even wished his son to be christened Calvin, which was not done. He died soon after, in 1556. Calvin, as godfather, was insistent that the boy should not be taken away into papistry, for he feared his mother would leave the Gospel to return to the defilements of the world. Before she could escape from Geneva it was necessary for her brother to threaten an appeal to the King of France. The 'Registre' remarks, 'one must be amazed at nothing when one tries to do good': ('qu'on ne s'estonne de rien en bien faisant'). Calvin's fears were not justified, for Lady Stafford went to Basel, where she was received with great respect.

Thomas Lever, who first fled to Zürich, had represented the moderate party at Frankfort and contributed to the Liturgy of Compromise. He did not stay long in Geneva, but answered a call to the congregation at Wesel. Driven thence by Lutheran intolerance, he returned to Switzerland and settled with his followers at Aarau, where they were permitted to manufacture cloth.

An important member of the community was John Bodley. With William Williams he financed the printing press entrusted to Rouland Hall, from which issued the Geneva Bible. His son Thomas, then aged 13, had Calvin and Beza for tutors; he became a diplomat, and to him the restored and extended Bodleian Library owes its name.

Of John Knox we will mention only that in Geneva was printed his 'First Blast of the Trumpet against the monstruous Regiment of Women,' which, aimed at Queen Mary, Mary Queen of Scots, and the Queen Mother, Mary of Guise, was looked on

with disfavour by the Anglican exiles, and incurred the mistrust of Elizabeth, so that later he was not allowed to cross England, but had to sail from France to Edinburgh. In his 'Answer to a Great Number of blasphemous Cavillations,' he extols Geneva as a city poor in the eyes of men, but rich in the grace of God, hated less on account of the doctrine of predestination than of the strict discipline and justice which prevail in it.

William Kethe contributed with Whitingham to the translation of the Psalms into English verse. His Old Hundredth, 'All people that on earth do dwell,' is known throughout the English-speaking world.

Thomas Bentham, an Oxford graduate versed in Greek and Hebrew, came on from Zürich but did not stay long. He reproached himself with being at ease in exile, and returned to England during the height of the persecutions to preach the Gospel secretly. He afterwards became Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry.

Such in brief were a few of the active members of the church. Probably in no small town in that age were so many notable and learned exiles gathered; their after record is proof of their quality. On arriving in Geneva, in October, 1555, they set to work to establish their position. Within four months, in February, 1556, was issued from the press of Jean Crespin an octavo book[6] which contained their constitution, confession of faith and liturgy; and, in addition, a selection of fifty-one Psalms in English verse (mostly by Thomas Sternholde) with music, and Calvin's catechism translated into English. The preface was inscribed 'To our bretherne in Englande, and els where which loue Jesus Christe unfaynedly, mercie, and peace.' At the same time, for the benefit of Calvin, who knew no English, they issued a Latin translation[7] which should have his support in making known their tenets to the other churches of the continent.

The activity that followed may be realized from a very short selection of the more important works printed in Geneva during

[6] The forme of prayers and administration of the Sacraments, &c, vsed in the Englishe Congregation at Geneua : and approued, by the famous and godly learned man, John Caluyn.

[7] Ratio et forma publice orandi Deum, atque administrandi Sacramenta, etcaet, in anglorum ecclesiam, quae Geneuae colligitur, recepta : cum judicio & comprobatione D. Johannis Caluini.

this time of exile. They were:

The New Testament (1557).

How superior Powers ought to be obeyd of their subjects: and Wherein they may lawfully by God's Worde be disobeyed and resisted. By Christopher Goodman (1558). (To this is added a poem by W. Kethe.)

The first Blast of the Trumpet against the monstruous regiment of women. (Very probably at Geneva) (1558).

The Book of Psalms, with dedicatory epistle to Queen Elizabeth, printed by Rouland Hall (1559).

The Bible (Old and New Testament) dedicated to Queen Elisabeth, printed by Rouland Hall (1560).

An Answer to a great nomber of blasphemous cauillations written by an Anabaptist and aduersarie to Gods eternal Predestination. And confuted by John Knox (1560).

On the accession of Elizabeth the refugees were free to return home.[8] Notwithstanding the experience and learning they had gained in foreign churches and universities, they were not well received:

'We have at this time not only to contend with our adversaries, but even with those of our friends who of late years have fallen away from us and gone over to the opposite party; and who are now opposing us with a bitterness and obstinacy far exceeding that of any common enemy . . . Not one of us has yet even his own property restored to him.'

Thus Jewel to Bullinger in May, 1559. Some of the more moderate collaborated in revising the Prayer Book and in drawing up the Thirty-nine Articles of 1561; some became deans or bishops; but, with Whitingham, Lever, Sampson and Goodman, a number incurred hostility for their nonconformity. Few of them submitted without reserve to the authority of the archbishops, and often were Calvin, Beza, Peter Martyr and Bullinger consulted as to how they ought to act. Nicholas des Gallars, indeed, pastor of the French in London, considered that, seeing that the purity of doctrine was now assured, their intransigence over the small remnants of papacy was immoderate.

Dr. A. F. Mitchell thinks the English Church would have gained if the exiles had been made welcome, and if, instead of their being repressed, an endeavour had been made to win every advantage from their seriousness and rich scholarship. In any case, on foreign soil was English Puritanism established. Prin-

[8] Some few remained behind with Whitingham, Gilby and Hall to complete the printing of the Bible. On their leaving it was decreed that an attestation be given as to their character, and that they be exhorted to do to foreigners as had been done to them.

ciples of government were framed which made the members of the Church conscious of their own responsibility, principles which still hold good in the English-speaking world. A Psalter was written in English verse which was long used in England and in Scotland, and a translation of the Bible was achieved which in later times, when conditions were far more favourable, still commanded respect.

H. Alexander Clay.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE GOSPEL OF MODERNISM*

As the Bishop of Birmingham says in the Foreword to this very interesting little book, 'The Gospel of Modernism is indeed "good news." In the message there is not only modern knowledge; there are also beauty and holiness, power and peace.' What is the Gospel of Modernism? Here is Mr. Richardson's opening sentence: 'The Gospel of Modernism is the Gospel of the Spirit, the proclamation of a Divine Spirit Who is the Source of all Creation, the Reality of all things real, and the Revealer of Himself in the experience of men.' 'Man,' he says later on, 'is *by nature* a spiritual being, the child of God.'

The first chapter on *The Foundations of Belief* is perhaps, as the author himself admits, rather difficult reading, largely because he packs so much into it. But his argument is clear and fresh. He follows similar lines to those chosen by Dr. Tennant in his great volumes on *Philosophical Theology,* and he makes his points distinctly and with conviction. We do not wish, he says, for instance, 'to proclaim God as immediately active in natural laws. We should but do a disservice to religion, since in their train follows evil as well as good. The fact of profound significance — and it is sufficient to begin with — is that Nature, by the uniformity and quality of her working, enables us to read a character into her; nay, actually compels us to do so.'

The rest of the book is straightforward and holds the close attention of the reader to the end. The short chapter on *The Main Stream of Religious Evolution* gives a rapid and masterly sketch of the development of religion during the period covered by the Old Testament. Another illuminating chapter is that on *The Teaching and Person of Jesus,* and in the next Mr. Richardson drives his conclusion home. Men must be brought to Christ 'as the Supreme Revealer of God, apart from any one theological estimate of His person.' They 'need to know Him under Whom they live; and they need to love Him — deeply, widely, eternally. Only through Christ is such love toward God possible. Only through Christ too is possible that real love of man for all men without which the pressing task of re-shaping human society can never be accomplished.'

Naturally where so much is touched upon there are details open to criticism. Occasionally Mr. Richardson seems to read too much into the text of scripture, *e.g.* into the word *historesai,* Gal. i, 18. More often he is inclined to cross too much out: it is surely going too far to say that probably Christ 'was buried in a common grave with the criminals who were crucified with Him.' The chapter on *The Church* is meagre and somewhat under-estimates

* *The Gospel of Modernism.* By Rev. R. D. Richardson, M.A., B.Litt. (Skeffington. The Modernist Series, 1933. 3/6.)

the authority of 'apostles' in the earliest days, while the first Christians appear to have been qualified for membership of the Modern Churchmen's Union to a degree that causes a small question mark to steal into the margin. But such idiosyncrasies are more than compensated for by exegesis and quotation both striking and suggestive. Two examples, in conclusion, must suffice. The first is concerned with the beatitude on *the pure in heart:* 'Remembering that the Jews regarded the heart as the seat of the mind and conscience and not of the emotions, we might translate it, "Ah! the blessedness of the single-minded!"' And why? Because 'theirs is the Vision of God'; their inward eye is wonderfully cleared to behold the 'Spirit and the Truth.' If, therefore, the eye be single—if there be no beam or speck of self-love to cloud it—the whole soul is full of light, the light of God. Not, however, if the eye be 'evil,' that is—according to the Jewish thought behind the Greek—grudging, in responding to the inner promptings of the soul. Therefore, Jesus demands absolute consecration to such vision and inspiration as are vouchsafed to us. The second refers to *Love* as a 'note' of the early Church: 'A full Christianity is instinct with the principle of brotherhood. "When thou seest thy brother thou seest thy Lord," says an early Christian.'

No one reading Mr. Richardson's book can doubt that Christian Modernism presents religion as something real and vital and inspiring.

J. W. HUNKIN.

THE CONCEPTION OF GOD IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF AQUINAS*

This is not a book for the ordinary reader but a welcome one for the scholar. St. Thomas has received much unenlightening praise and much indiscriminating abuse. We have many excellent studies of St. Thomas by Roman Catholic writers, but this careful study of a great thinker from an obviously independent standpoint should do a great deal to promote a wider appreciation of the intrinsic worth of the philosophy of Aquinas.

The great value of Dr. Patterson's book lies in his analyses. He has a thorough knowledge of Aquinas, and is well acquainted with Neo-scholastic philosophy. And he has set out point by point the long complicated argument, which, as he says, quoting M. Sertillanges, 'is the task of the entire theodicy' (p. 363). In Part I he treats of the existence of God, showing that four of the five proofs are reducible to the same principle, and that Kant did not deal with these proofs in the form used by St. Thomas. In this section Anselm is summarily dealt with. St. Thomas' 'main reason for refusing to accept the ontological argument is the same that has influenced all philosophers who have rejected it from Gaunilo to Kant—the abysmal nature of the gap that separates the world of existence from that of thought. In his view there is no aerial pathway by which this gap may be traversed. It is as impassable as that which sunders Dives from Lazarus. No idea contains in itself the guarantee of the existence of its object' (p. 28). Yet Anselm's argument is at bottom the affirmation of the principle of sufficient reason, and on this (*cf.* p. 55) St. Thomas' own case rests.

Part II, after a discussion of the possibility of the *via remotionis*—how God exceeds our highest thought of Him,—is a detailed treatment of fourteen 'negative qualities' of God. This part is followed by consideration of the attempt of Aquinas to combine with this approach positive knowledge of God by analogy. In the opening chapter of this latter section St. Thomas'

* *The Conception of God in the Philosophy of Aquinas.* By R. L. Patterson. (Allen & Unwin. 1933. 21/- net.)

opposition to the great Jewish thinker Maimonides is interestingly treated. The last section is entitled 'God and the World,' and covers the teaching of Aquinas on Creation, Conservation, and Providence, with a brief chapter on St. Thomas' attitude towards mysticism. In the chapter on Creation in one place Dr. Patterson unwisely condemns Aquinas' acceptance of theological truth (pp. 370-1). 'The right of veto accorded theology, whereby any conclusion resulting from philosophical speculation which was not in harmony with the faith might be condemned, constituted a permanent shackle upon the reason. Nor is it justifiable to describe the influence thus exercised by theology as purely limiting and negative. From the nature of the case it must be impossible for a thinker who knows beforehand the prescribed conclusions at which he must arrive, or with which the results of his deliberations must at least be capable of being harmonized, not to be continually influenced throughout the development of his thought by the desire to conform to the dictates of an external authority, in spite of the fact that his duty as a philosopher is "to follow the argument wherever it may lead."' Dr. Patterson may be in the right in objecting to the attitude of St. Thomas to theological dogma, and the matter is worth discussion; but the argument as he frames it would rule out from being a philosopher the holder of any religious belief. For no religion is so devoid of content as to leave its thinkers free to think anything at all, or uninfluenced in the conclusions they reach. And the position that it is possible to accept the Christian interpretation of the world and yet philosophize freely is no unworthy one, and one we have no right to criticize St. Thomas for maintaining. Dr. Patterson does not include in this volume a discussion of the doctrine of the Trinity, giving as his reason that 'Aquinas maintained that the truth of this doctrine cannot be proved by philosophy and is made known to us by revelation' (p. 482). No one will grumble at the author for limiting himself to what he has given us; yet in thus accepting Aquinas' position as to the relation of reason and revelation he is dismissing a great issue, on which, to say the least, much can be said against St. Thomas.

The book is a really good exposition of the philosopsy of St. Thomas. If there is a weakness it is that we are not given any clear estimate as a whole of the thought brought before us. This does not mean that the author shrinks from vigorous criticism or acute questioning in detail, or that he has no power of concise summary. Far from it, *e.g.* p. 119, 'Granting that we can, without contradiction, think of a changeless life, a changeless thought, a changeless love, and a changeless volition, how can God, who is the cause of the ever-changing world, enter into relations with that world, unless he responds to its multitudinous changes by corresponding changes on his part?' Or p. 406, 'Thus the view which we sometimes hear expressed to-day that the noblest exercise of the creative power would be "the creation of creators" is at the opposite pole from the position of St. Thomas. To his mind it is the utter inability of even the most exalted finite being to create that reveals unmistakably the divine character of the act.' All students of Aquinas' thought will be grateful for the book.

H. Cunliffe-Jones.

THE NEW APPROACH TO THE BIBLE*

The results of the modern literary and historical study of the Bible, usually designated as the Higher Criticism, have been steadily accumulating during the last century. They have transformed the Bible in the eyes of those who possess a working knowledge both of the methods and

* *The Heart of the Bible.* By Jeannie B. Thomson Davies, M.A. (Three volumes, 5/- each. George Allen & Unwin. 1933.)

results of such research: they have made the Bible comprehensible and intensely interesting and have moreover solved problems connected with Biblical inspiration, revelation, and infallibility. These results, secured by serious and competent students, have been all to the good. Unfortunately serious and competent students compose but a very small proportion of the Christian Church, and that because only a very small number of people possess the education and ability to become such. The first stage in becoming a competent student is a very disconcerting one. It consists in unlearning nearly all the commonly accepted views about the Bible — its character and its composition. This is a very painful experience. The novice feels that he is losing everything which gave the Bible value in his eyes and is receiving nothing in its place. His first impulse is either to abandon this new method of studying the Bible, in order to retain his faith in the Bible, or else to continue the study and give up his Christian Faith. There is a third option and that is to give up reading the Bible and thinking about it, and that is what most people are doing to-day because it demands no effort.

To present the results of the Higher Criticism in a simple, intelligible, interesting manner and with the result that the Bible becomes not only more interesting but more helpful in the moral and spiritual life than it has been heretofore is a matter of extreme difficulty. To do this for quite ordinary people—whether Sunday School teachers or young parents or the senior classes in day schools is the *crux*.

Many have attempted it, and those efforts in which the living voice and the personality of the teacher are used have been, in many cases, successful. But the presentation of this needful teaching in books has had far less success. We know a great number of volumes in which the effort has been made, and we confess that in too many cases a certain dullness and dreariness pervades them. They lack picturesqueness, arresting power, fascination, inspiration: everything in short which young people seem to demand to make a book readable. At last, it seems to us, something like real success has been achieved in the effort to popularize the results of Biblical Higher Criticism, and this success has been achieved by a woman, Mrs. Thomson Davies in her book *The Heart of the Bible*. Her method consists of the arrangement of very skilfully selected extracts from the Biblical literature in their chronological order. Each group of extracts has an admirable introduction and comments.

In her first volume she covers the whole period of the Israelite religion down to the return from the Exile.

In her second volume she deals with the period which begins with Ezra, and concludes with the last century before Christ.

Her third volume is concerned with the New Testament period and its literature.

All three volumes are extraordinarily attractive and are delightfully printed and well arranged. It would be absurd where the mass of knowledge from which selection has to be made is so great and where, in certain cases the judgments of scholars are in conflict, to expect to find ourselves in agreement with Mrs. Thomson Davies on every point. For instance, in dealing with the E. Decalogue, as we have it expanded in *Exodus* xx and the second version of it in *Deut.* v, she fails to contrast it with the J. Decalogue of *Exodus* xxxiv and to face the problem which these two types of Decalogue present in their second tables. In E. and D. the second table consists in the primary demands of social righteousness, but J.'s second table consists of the precepts of a sacrificial ritual.

Or, to take another instance, Mrs. Thomson Davies speaks of Jezebel's God as Baal but gives no indication that Baal was the title and not the proper name of her God Melkarth and that a true-hearted worshipper of Jehovah could with perfect loyalty at this period have applied the title Baal to Jehovah. It was only after the teaching of Hosea and the Deuteronomic Reformation that the title Baal could no longer be loyally applied to Jehovah. 'It shall be at that day, saith the Lord, that thou shalt call me Ishi: and shalt call me no more Baali. For I will take away the names of Baali out of her mouth' (*Hos.* ii, 16, 17). Of course, the way in which Baal is used in the Book of Kings is a proof of its post-Deuteronomic date. But criticism of this kind is really meticulous. Mrs. Thomson Davies has in our judgment performed a most remarkable feat and is deserving of no little gratitude by those who desire to see the Bible restored to its former place in the homes and lives of English people. We know of no better book to commend to those who wish to begin to study their Bible in the new way.

H.D.A.M.

MYSTERY, CHURCH AND SACRAMENT

Dr. Mozley has compressed within a book of little more than a hundred pages* a clear and very readable exposition of a sacramental theology which is substantially the same as that of the Tractarians. We can confidently recommend it to the attention of the student who wishes to get a good grasp of the general principles which underlie that theology. There is a hint, however, that Dr. Mozley's conception of the Church is not as rigid or mechanical as that of the Tractarians when, describing the Church as an organism, he says that it 'is not a question of type of organization, or even of organization as such at all; the controversies which revolve round the problems that the word "organization" suggests are never likely to reach a final settlement.'

The book opens with a chapter on the Sacramental Principle. It is a principle which pervades all creation, for man meets with God within the natural order, and is thereby strengthened and refreshed. It finds expression in the relationship between body and soul. But in the Christian Sacraments, which belong to a realm other than the realm of nature, there is something *sui generis*. Grace, Faith and Redemption are of the essence of Christian sacramentalism.

Dr. Mozley is on sure ground when he urges that the grace of God which is given through the sacraments is not different in kind from the grace which is received through non-sacramental channels. He is on more questionable ground when he draws a sharp distinction between God's way to man and man's way to God. The sacraments, he says, are 'God's way to man, not man's way to God.' The antithesis is misleading if, with St. James, we hold that when man draws nigh to God, God draws nigh to man. On St. James' view we shall see a manifestation of the grace of God in every approach of man towards goodness, in every noble aspiration. The dualism implicit in the antithesis is radical and underlies the whole of Dr. Mozley's sacramental theology.

The Christian Church is, to Dr. Mozley, sacramental through and through in that it is the Body of Christ. Its sacramental nature, however, may only be perceived through Faith.

* *The Gospel Sacraments.* By J. K. Mozley, D.D., Canon of St. Paul's. (Published by Hodder & Stoughton, Ltd. 1933. Price 3/6.)

> 'The mystery of Jesus the Messiah and Son of God is prolonged in the mystery of His Church. In the days of His flesh it was the eye of faith alone that could penetrate beneath the form of the Jewish teacher and prophet and confess the presence of the Christ of God. So was and is it with the Church: to faith alone is its true nature revealed. "The hidden glory of Christ" to use Dr. Frick's expression, taken from his chapter in *Mysterium Christi,* is continued in the hidden glory of the Church. . . But it is only from within the Church, where the witness given is the witness of the Spirit speaking through the Church, that the final confession can be made. "The Church is the Body of Christ."'

There is an esoteric tang about this passage. We sense at least a trace of that fog which, generated in the world of post-War Teutonic theology, has in some measure drifted across the North Sea. The use of the expression 'the eye of faith' suggests the existence of some mysterious means of apprehension which is not available to the world, some faculty whereby alone we may perceive the 'hidden glory' of Christ or of the sacramental Church. But, whatever faith is, it is not sight. In faith there is an element of inference, and behind faith lie those value-judgments which are part of our primary experience. The faith which corresponds to revelation in its ascending stages is essentially rational.

When, with Dr. Mozley, we say that within the natural order we meet God, we mean that from our experience of the beauty and grandeur of the creation we are led to a conception of the Creator which compels worship. The inferential step is there whether or not it be explicit or conscious. Nor is it otherwise with the higher levels of faith. 'The revelation made through Bethlehem or Calvary or the sacraments,' says Dr. Mozley, 'is a revelation made to faith.' By the revelation made through Bethlehem or Calvary he presumably means the revelation made through the life and death of Jesus, 'the Jewish teacher and prophet.' It is difficult to see what else he can mean. Again, on this higher level, faith is essentially rational, for in Jesus the believer sees, focussed in one exceeding bright light, the scattered lights which have to him been broken intimations of the Divine. That is why he is led to acclaim Him as Son of God, as Word of God, as that Light which lighteth every man coming into the world. But if faith be thus conceived as a reasonable faith it seems impossible to regard as of the same character revelation made through Jesus and revelation made through the sacraments. It is impossible to equate such a faith with an alleged ability to perceive an objective relationship between a consecrated wafer and the Body of Christ.

'The Church in its sacramental character as the Body of Christ,' writes Dr. Mozley, 'can no more be appreciated by the world than can the particular sacraments which the Church dispenses.' There is, no doubt, a very significant sense in which 'the world' is incapable of faith. The man whose appreciation of beauty has been coarsened by indulgence in the vulgar cacophonies of the modern dance-hall will be little likely to perceive divine beauty in the song of the lark; nor, at a higher level, will the 'worldly' man who has concentrated his attention on the pursuit of selfish pleasure and personal aggrandisement easily perceive the glory of God in Jesus of Nazareth.

Though Dr. Mozley deplores the moral faults which have stained the history of the Church, and readily admits the legitimacy of ethical criticism of the Church by those outside, he does not allow such considerations to

modify his contention that the Church is sacramentally the Body of Christ. On the contrary, he urges that 'the Church is not primarily an ethical society, just as Christ was not primarily an ethical teacher.' That there are theologians who regard the ethical appeal of Jesus as secondary is a regrettable aftermath of the excesses of the Eschatalogical School. In view of our Lord's saying, 'Not every one that saith unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven,' we may hope that their view represents only a passing fashion. Though it is true that ideally and metaphorically the Church is the Body of Christ, the measure of its approximation to or remoteness from the ideal is provided by its fruits. Dr. Mozley says that 'ethic is the fruit not the root of true religion.' Jesus said 'By their fruits ye shall know them.' It is a criterion from which even the Church may not escape, and the application of this criterion will make us very suspicious of any tendency to regard the Church as the Body of Christ except in a relative sense.

From the Sacramental Church Dr. Mozley passes on to the sacraments dispensed by the Church, and, while doing so, he carries his sharp dualism between the Church as the realm of grace and the World as the realm of nature to its logical conclusion. This is specially noticeable in his baptismal theology. The baptized person, in virtue of his passage into the one realm from the other becomes 'other than he was before.' Even when an infant he is a 'new person.' Dr. Mozley's affinities are definitely with those elements in St. Paul's sacramental teaching which many students trace to the influence of the Mystery Religions. He lays stress on the rubric at the end of the *Service of Public Baptism of Infants* which affirms the undoubted salvation of baptized children who die before committing actual sin, and infers that it is the new relationship between the child and God, brought about by the baptismal rite, which assures its salvation. Whatever may be our view on the relationship between Pauline sacramentalism and the Mystery Religions, we here breathe the very air of Mystery Religion. We must add that when we read in the Gospels of our Lord's relationship with children and His attitude to them we find ourselves in a very different atmosphere.

The 'virtue of the Lord's sacrificial death' holds a central place in Dr. Mozley's baptismal theology. In view of what he says about infant baptism it is clear that his theory of the Atonement cannot be Abelardian. How far it may be described as vicarious or as propitiatory does not appear; but it is no less central in his Eucharistic than in his baptismal theology.

> 'It is common ground in Christian sacramentalism that Christ is present in the Eucharist in a manner to which there is no parallel outside that sacrament, to make His Body and His Blood, those abiding sacrificial realities, available as the food of His people.'

This presence is not only real; it is also objective. 'The Body and Blood of Christ as the thing signified has an objective reality prior to reception.' A presence to the manner of which there is no parallel is a conception not easy to grasp. The spiritual presence of Christ where two or three are gathered together in His name, whether in a Quaker meeting-house or elswhere, is as real as any presence can be. Beyond this it seems perilous to go.

About the much-debated question of the Dominical institution of the Eucharist as a permanent rite Dr. Mozley says little. Questions of history are not prominent in his book. He stresses the evidence of St. Paul, and dismisses the negative evidence of the Gospels with the remark that 'the

ilence of St. Mark as to the command is not conclusive.' This puts the egative evidence altogether too low, especially if we accept as genuine the horter text of the Lucan narrative of the Last Supper.

G. L. H. HARVEY.

THINGS NEW AND OLD*

We are glad to see another cheap re-issue of the ever-popular *Outspoken ssays.*

It must have been a memorable experience to have heard these two ermons and six addresses, *Things New and Old,* delivered to under-raduates of Cambridge in Great St. Mary's. In them an old man — who pens playfully by asking, 'Am I not necessarily a fossil, a dug-out, a id-Victorian, almost an antediluvian?' — thoughtfully surveys his faith, s ground, and how he comes by it; and his world, what can be gleaned its history and guessed of its future; that perchance he may help some those setting out on the course he is finishing. He speaks from wide nowledge on many and difficult themes; he has arrived at certain con-usions which he puts trenchantly; but chiefly he has helped young men nd women by the frankness of his self-revelation and by the freedom he as granted them to share his experience. He does it most gracefully; his *onfessio fidei* is unembarrassed because purposeful. A glance at a life is orth more to a beginner than much large thought about life.

The opening sermon is a swift cavalcade of three reigns, the War and ost-War England. It strikes a note to be often repeated:

> 'There is one thing which I wish to impress upon you to start with. You cannot put things right by making an abrupt break with the past. You cannot create a new society or a new religion; you might as well try to build a tree.'

t is a caution the more likely to be heard because not on the lips of a raditionalist. The Dean is anxious, sometimes desperately, at the cost of onsistency, to recognize clearly and weigh fairly all that passes as modern. nlike too many cantankerous ecclesiastics, he seldom quotes a Modern ive favourably, and in support of his own thought. Bernard Shaw, Ber-and Russell, Paul Bourget and even Lenin is each called as witness on his point or that by this advocate of a Christianity which is 'part of our heritance as civilized Europeans,' which 'has combined and gathered to itself the legacies of Greece, Palestine and Rome,' and which 'has rown and changed a good deal, and must change still further.'

In the first address the stage is set. From the sixth century before Christ ll the rise of Islam was a 'wonderful millennium,' a flowering of the Spirit Brahminism and Gautama Buddha; in Orphism, Pythagoreanism and in lato; in the Jewish prophets who 'drank of the same Spirit, and our Lord ho deliberately placed Himself in the prophetic succession'; and last, in slam. The address concludes with a warm appreciation of Buddhism:

> 'An English officer in the Burmese war remarked, "These fellows would have given us a lot of trouble if they had been Christians instead of Buddhists." This possibly ought to make us a little uncomfortable.'

In the second address the Dean, at ease in his own home, discusses the ystical insight and morality of the Greek Mysteries and so comes to Plato, 'A Christian before Christ.'' An ultimate dualism in Plato is denied. His Eternal' is displayed as the 'Eternal Life' of St. John, his 'participa-

* *Outspoken Essays.* First and Second Series. By W. R. Inge, D.D. (Swan Library e-issue, 1933. 3/6 each.)

Things New and Old. By W. R. Inge, D.D. (Longmans, Green & Co. 1933. 3/6, aper Cover 2/6.)

tion' in the world 'yonder' as St. Paul's 'Christ in you,' 'Christ formed in you.' The third address begins by a brief, epigrammatic review of Hebrew religion and passes at once to Jesus of Nazareth. It is with the man Jesus, and we judge rightly, that the Dean would have a Christian commence his religious thinking and belief:

> 'It is a little difficult for a Christian, who believes that "in Christ dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily," to put himself in the position of those who walked with Him in Galilee. But this is what I want you to do. Putting aside the later Christian dogma and Church history, what was new and vital in the life and teaching of Jesus?'

Nor has the Dean much time either for later dogma about the Person of Christ — 'There is no test of orthodoxy except a Christian life' — or for institutionalism and 'loyalty to the beloved community' as a substitute for knowledge and love of the historic Jesus. We 'cut the root from whence our faith derives its sap' if we 'say with Loisy that we acknowledge "comme deux Christs," the historical Jesus and the object of the Church's worship.'

By now the breadth and range of the addresses is clear. Christianity is presented in its historical and philosophical perspective, one manifestation of the power of the Spirit, and in the result the importance and the appeal of Christianity are not diminished but increased. This is an apologetic, humane, cultured and rational, sadly out of fashion to-day. It takes not by attrition of logic-chopping, nor does it stampede by raising ogres of human limitation and depravity, nor yet assault with deadening German rhetoric, *ad hominem*, and surcharged darkly with emotion: this apologetic persuades the mind and heart and moves them by its power to reveal the world and their place in it; and doing all, gives pleasure. It is what poetry should be, 'a medicine of cherries.'

The burden of the fourth address is what is called the social question, and many readers, and they not all young, will not feel happy here. There is a curious inconsistency in the Dean. It is most frequently evident in chance sayings or epigrams which often contradict the general tenor of his thought and sometimes each other. In part, in this book at any rate, such contradictions are a tribute to the vastness of his canvas and the breadth and fairness of his vision and are natural to a delightfully easy, almost conversational style. On p. 1 the War is 'a great deluge, obliterating old landmarks, leaving nothing as it was before'; on p. 96, 'the long view' is said to 'damp the rather childish talk about this being a new world after the War.' On p. 40 there is taken to task the notion of 'one increasing purpose (whatever an increasing purpose may mean)'; yet on p. 47 the idea of evolution is said to colour all our thoughts; Edward Caird is quoted, 'True Christianity is a living and growing spirit that learns the lessons of history and is ever manifesting new powers and leading on to new truths'; and on p. 61, while human progress as of law is dismissed, in a fine passage we are exhorted not to lose the rapture of Meredith's 'forward view' and reminded of our duty to posterity, of the 'happier future we shall never see,' of the 'hope of a Christophany in redeemed humanity itself.' Seen at the right distance these bold touches of paint fit together.

But when the Dean touches on social questions the inconsistency is not only verbal. It is also that. On p. 10 the Russian Revolution is said to have set up State Capitalism which has 'no essential connexion' with 'the dogmatic materialism and atheism of Karl Marx' and 'the destruction of religion will certainly not be permanent'; on p. 15 stands the phrase,

'the cast-iron materialistic collectivism of Bolshevik Russia.' The deeper inconsistency is in the omissions. The Dean states lucidly the Social Gospel in the New Testament. Men are brethren since God is their Father, and the world is God's creation. But he never says, nor inquires, how the Christian is to perform his social duty in the modern world unless by fulfilling a purely private morality. There is no exhortation to the young men listening to him to think out political and economic questions both as Christians and practical people, but by many implications the attempt is deprecated, and chiefly as unnecessary. The Dean is satisfied, on the whole, with society as he finds it. The middle class is increasing; class itself is disappearing; the working class is better paid, and modern business is worthy of an eulogy which contains the saying, 'Business honour is the foundation of modern business.' In so far as this rosy picture is true is largely the consequence of state interference in the spheres of industry, health and education; of Socialism and of Christian Socialism, all of which the Dean so much dislikes, though he does not condemn them in this book. Unfortunately, the picture is far from altogether true. In one particular, they will hesitate to eulogize modern business who know how impersonal and ruthless the handling of staffs has become since the War; who remember the long list of swindling financiers and big business men convicted in recent years; who have learnt the obduracy of the slum-property owner and seen a jerry-built house after three years' occupation; who are aware of cutting down of production and destruction of goods in a society which has millions of under-fed and poorly clothed members; or who have glimpsed only a limb or two of that octopus of graft and corruption which sucks life out of modern business and passes euphemistically as 'commission.' Sometimes it seems the Dean is evading issues of which he cannot but be aware. On p. 63 he writes: 'I entreat you once more to keep your heads on political and economic questions. . . We find' (in the Gospels) 'many stern warnings about the danger and deceitfulness of riches. . . I am more and more convinced that it is not a good thing for anybody to have a great deal of money.' The caution against riches is excellent but, in the context, wholly beside the point. How many young or old men to-day are concerned with political and economic questions in order to gain personal wealth? The Dean seems incapable of realizing that the modern social problem requires more for its solution than the pursuit by the individual of the good life, though that indisputably to a Christian is a *sine qua non*. Nor does he seem to realize that the Christian, by the very nature of his calling, has a duty to attempt that problem and that Christian action in the world cannot be confined to fulfilment of a private morality in an alien, or morally neutral, society. It is the price Liberal Protestantism has paid for its courageous return to the New Testament in an age which happened to be committed to *laissez faire* theories. The Christian Ethic was almost wholly a private morality in the First Century; it has never been so since. Even if the Dean's eulogy of business were justified the moral worth and intention of business men is not the modern issue. That issue is how to arrange economic, political and business life efficiently, and one test of efficiency is the production and distribution of goods to the only rational limit, the full satisfaction of the material needs of men. Moral business men, admittedly the majority, are morally helpless in the present chaos and are the first to say so. The Dean recognizes most of the relevant facts, but separately, and never draws the conclusion. He tells us the machine is superseding the labour of man. He admits his listeners will have difficulty to find work on leaving Cambridge. He does not point out, what is also true, that six million men and

women, or one-half of the wage-earners in this country, are unemployed and in receipt of some form of relief for bare necessities for long or short periods in the course of a year. Clearly change and re-organization and creation of institutions are necessary, but the Dean goes so far as to declare such projects un-Christian because not *inward*. Yet he states concisely the attitude in which a Christian should approach the problems. 'The master-word of Christian Social Ethics is *service,*' and he quotes tellingly the pregnant words of Bishop King on ordaining him, 'Disinterestedness is the one thing that matters.' The truth may be that the Dean cares for any of these things only with reluctance. He is by nature a gifted mystic: the world, in his own words in this book, is only half-real; and an aristocrat, able to view with equanimity the loss of political freedom 'because we are not able to govern ourselves.' But he is also a great Christian, and Christianity is, at least in one aspect, a prophetic religion, rooted in earth and concerned with the world; and it is, as he reminds us, a religion of the Spirit which at Pentecost '"sat upon each of them"—not only on the apostles—but upon young and old, even to the servants and handmaidens.' The inconsistency belongs to the breadth and strength of the character.

In the fifth address hydra-headed Naturalism is entertainingly slain by a warrior unencumbered by defence of miracle, and scientific humanism is sympathetically reviewed and firmly distinguished from Christianity. The last address crowns the whole argument. From an initial act of faith in God, a making of the 'noblest hypothesis' which is verified by experience, the Christian proceeds by way of the Revelation in Jesus to knowledge, and at last to love of God. Even where love of God is a reality for us, the act of faith must be a continuing one, and 'faith can only come into its own by being lived.' Throughout the progress, which is the religious life, the action is from God to man. It is God who implants the faith that will lead to the Vision of God. The concluding sermon is a short history of the Seven Ages of man and is lit by sane and often shrewd advice to him who would follow in the footsteps of a wise and inspiring guide. M.T.D.

RELIGIOUS BOOKS FOR CHILDREN*

It is encouraging to notice a distinct improvement from the Modernist standpoint in some of the religious books now being published for children. Modernists have no right to grumble at the alienation of people from the churches until they have done all that is possible so to present the Christian religion, as they believe it, that from the earliest years children may be led to grasp the great realities, rather than worried by dogmas which, though easily absorbed in childhood are likely to be rejected later to the immense detriment of the great realities of our faith. *Paul, Hero and Saint* comes with the blessing of Archdeacon Storr and it well deserves it. The writer confines herself mainly to St. Paul's life and, while at the end she mentions some of the Epistles briefly, there is little exposition of St. Paul's teaching. The book is distinctly Modernist and, this being so, it is a pity that the account of Saul's conversion and that of an angel giving assurance before the shipwreck are presented in such a fashion as to give false impressions to child readers. Modernists do not believe that natural laws of light or of the stars were interfered with at vital moments in our religious history; nor do they believe in angels whose messages can be discerned by the physical eye and ear. Why then teach children about these things? It

* *Paul, Hero and Saint.* By Mary F. Roet. (Alexander Maclehose, 1933. 3/6.)
Thank You, God. By Viryen Bremner. (The Challenge, 1933. 2/6.)

* *Tales from the Old Testament.* By the Rev. H. W. Fox. (Student Christian Movement Press. 1933. 3/6.)

seems a pity to give a literal version of *Acts* IX, iii, and to put into St. Paul's mouth the words, 'Last night an angel came to me from the God whom I serve and said . . .' The authoress is more successful with the story of the earthquake at Phillipi. But it may be ungrateful to make these criticisms, for the book is really good and helpful. Whether Old Masters form suitable illustrations in religious books for children is doubtful. Jan Bellegambe's 'Conversion of St. Paul' is scarcely helpful to young children.

Mrs. Bremner's book is very original and young children should love it. The few short stories about Jesus could scarcely be bettered. The illustrations also deserve high praise. One would like to see the authoress tackling on similar lines some of the Bible themes which are so spoilt for young children by the conventional way in which they are usually presented.

When Mr. Fox published his excellent *Child's Approach to Religion* (with a preface by Dr. David) there were probably many parents who, while reading it, expressed a wish that Mr. Fox would not only tell them how to teach the Bible to children, but would also provide books which children could read. It seemed so easy for Mr. Fox to write: 'If the ideas he [the child] receives are wrong, he may have to spend years of his life in unlearning them.' Modernist parents knew that already. To say this is not to be ungrateful for Mr. Fox's earlier book. It was helpful and stimulating, but it left the Modernist parent at the bottom of the hill.

Now Mr. Fox has begun the task of providing books which a Modernist can give his children with complete honesty. No praise can be too high for his new book, and for his excellent illustrator. This is no mere re-telling of Old Testament stories. Imagination is fully, and properly, brought in to help. Mr. Fox is superb in his simple explanation of the God of early Israel in contrast with the God of the Christians; his handling of the story of Adam and Eve (in which he boldly says that 'Adam knew by a kind of instinct' which was the forbidden tree—how much better for children than *Genesis* ii, 16 and 17) shows real genius; his version of the difficult story of the flood is both original and clever; so is his story about Samson's hair. The 'miraculous' crossing of the waters is not quite on a level with the rest of the book.

Mr. Fox should go on. He has in him a life of Jesus for very young children. Bishop Woodward's book, advertized on the dust-cover, can be excelled by Mr. Fox, and one may reasonably hope that he will tackle this much-needed task.

CLAUD MULLINS.

THE EVOLUTION OF THE SPIRITUAL*

The thesis of Dr. McKerrow's book is summarized in the following quotation: 'Did *homo sapiens* emerge in becoming God-fearing, or in beginning to talk and think? Is he the religious or the rational animal? Our whole discussion is an attempt to illuminate this problem, by adopting the former assumption and working out the consequences' (p. 89).

Pneumatology is the study of the spiritual life, in St. Paul's sense of the word. And since spirit, our author would have us to understand, is a true biological emergent, pneumatology is a science distinct from psychology, and can no more be described in psychological terms than psychology can be described in physiological terms. Those who attempt this description in the case of the spiritual life fall into an error parallel to that of the behaviourists in describing the rational life.

* *An Introduction to Pneumatology.* By James Clark McKerrow, M.B. (Longman, Green & Co., 1933. 6/-.)

The individual in his own life-history recapitulates the development of the race; and as at birth the baby passes from a vegetative to an animal existence, so at a later age the man passes from the animal to the truly human, or spiritual level. The latter crisis is that of conversion, and we read (p. 28) that 'The Christian myth of "redemption" is an intelligent anticipation of the scientific myth of "emergence."' As to those who never experience redemption, they remain merely animals, in the condition of St. Paul's 'natural man' ('*animalis homo*,' we remember, in the Vulgate translation of I *Cor.* ii, 14). Thus upon this theory we are able to describe the humanists with scientific detachment as only 'highly domesticated anthropoids' (p. 16).

The spiritual life, like conscious life and organic life, has gone through a process of development. As to the very first manifestations of the spiritual life, the author admits that 'there is a debatable and much debated land between the anthropoid animal and the religious man' (p. 20). But he continues more definitely (p. 21), 'Neither pious practices nor theological beliefs make a religion worthy of the name. The fear of the Gods that is not related in some degree to the conduct of life apart from pious practices, is as little religious as the animal fear of natural phenomena . . . *Homo sapiens* emerged when religious belief became to some extent the guide of life.' The ultimate flowering of this new creation the author finds in Christianity, whose 'saving mystery' 'as a symbol of the relation of man to God . . . seems incapable of improvement.' And again, 'We date the spiritual life, then, from the emergence of *homo sapiens*, but that only began a phylogenetic process, culminating, for the West, in Christianity.' The stages of development between the first and the last are filled up in a roughly Pauline manner. The first, that 'period in which the conditions of spiritual life are being prepared, of esoteric rites, not of cult proper, of theories of their efficacy, not of theology proper, of customary morality, not of morality proper,' is followed by the second, the stage of the 'dispensation of law' corresponding to 'our earliest phase of eschatological theorizing . . . In this phase of thought . . . neither gods nor the outer world can be considered truly supernatural.' Finally, 'by the first century of our era the theory of the spiritual life on earth is become definitely supernaturalistic, and what *we* call its emergent status is explicitly formulated in Christianity' (p. 88 ff).

Holding the view that Christianity is the natural product of the evolving human spirit, the author appears to think it unnecessary to believe in an historic Jesus. His position is shown by the following quotations:

> 'We find it incredible as a matter of historical probability, that Christianity should have been founded by an historical Jesus' (p. 3).
>
> 'The central Mystery of Christianity is not something that happened in Palestine nineteen hundred years ago, it is something that happens, by the grace of God, in the course of human development' (p. 95).

It has already been pointed out that, just as some people fail to achieve a full development intellectually, so others, like the humanists, fail to develop so far as to achieve a spiritual life. The author reaches a 'biological view of "election."' But we must believe that progress will continue, and that 'the many will not always be called in vain.' The characteristic notes of the spiritual life, as given by the author, are Revelation, Contrition, and Intention. Revelation means here not the formulation or the acceptance of notions about God, but the flash of insight which makes the creed to which one is born real and personal. The difference between the two is com-

parable with that between learning a proposition in Geometry by heart, and perceiving the truth of the proposition. Contrition means awareness of of sin. It is the avoiding-reaction of the soul to sin, and is made roughly parallel with affection, originally the avoiding-reaction of the body to pain; and just as the latter gives rise to conation, so contrition gives rise to Intention, which determines that an action is 'performed solely for the glory of God, without the alloy of any human motives' (p. 126). The difference between an action 'intended' by a true man, and an ordinary animal action, so to speak, is not visible to the eye. 'The spiritual man judgeth all things.' Thus William James' observation that the twice-born are not better than the unconverted, nor noticeably different in any way from them, is said to be beside the point; for the difference is an inner and private difference. That James overlooked this is on the contrary taken as evidence that he himself was not more than a rational animal; although the author holds out the possibility that he was 'unconsciously regenerate'!

The author's insistence upon the complete autonomy of the spiritual life leads him into some difficulties. He is forced to maintain that progressive revelation in the sense of the development of the concept of God is 'relatively unimportant' (p. 30): that the faith of Newman was no advance on that of Abraham (p. 31); and that Moloch, and Mammon may be, were worshipped in spirit and in truth (p. 166).

The belief that in man there is, beyond the intellect, some faculty which makes him aware of aspects of reality deeper than those embraced by the formulas of physical science, is not new. It is, of course, implicit in all religious writers, but was formulated in psychological terms at least as early as William James. It did not need a new book to tell us that the religious faculty is an 'emergent' in the general sense of being a biological novelty; and the consequences of applying to this faculty the specific theories of Alexander and Lloyd Morgan are not worked out. So that we are compelled to look for the author's original contribution in his analysis of the nature of the emergent. And this analysis is unsatisfactory and meagre in the extreme. Revelation, Contrition and Intention: what of the spirit which seeks truth; which seeks the Unchanging amid the temporal? what of worship and praise? Surely the true emergent is the ability to perceive a new kind of quality or value in and beyond nature. And that value or quality we may be content to call 'the numinous,' the perception of which, to quote Otto, 'has no place in the everyday natural world of ordinary experience, and is only possible to a being in whom has been awakened a mental disposition, unique in kind and different in a definite way from any "natural faculty"' (*The Idea of the Holy*, p. 15). Otto's further working out of the development, the rationalization and the refining of *this* emergent are well known, but the author never seems to have heard of Otto.

The style is epigrammatic, allusive, and far from clear, and the method of developing an argument is unnecessarily tortuous; but there is more than sufficient thought, if hazardous thought, in this volume to make it worth while for the few studiously interested in the psychology of religion to read it.

R. J. STANFORD.

THE IMPATIENCE OF A LAYMAN*

In a shortish book of 118 pages (with a preface and a foreword by Dr. Stanton Coit) Mr. Stutchbury exposes very clearly some of the most important inconsistencies between knowledge common to modern men and the

* *Church Reform: A National Obligation.* By G. F. Stutchbury. (Watts. 1933. 3/6.)

teaching of the English Church, as formulated in the Creeds and in the thirty-nine Articles, and as commonly preached.

The attack is sweeping and disposes of the doctrines of the Trinity, of Apostolical Succession, and of the Atonement, as well as of one or two minor doctrines. Nor do the Modernist clergy escape; for if their inconsistency does not lie in stating incredible doctrines in the teeth of confessed facts, it lies in their acceptance of these facts while still retaining their Orders.

Mourning the real loss both to the English Church and State which the Church's ambiguous position involves, Mr. Stutchbury advocates reform, perhaps after investigation by a Royal Commission, giving reasons for believing that Disestablishment would bring worse ills than those we have. The supernatural functions of the Church he would have discarded, to leave it free to exercise its 'natural' functions, which consist in 'rendering to the country a number of unsectarian services mainly of an ethical, aesthetical, and social nature.' In the value of these services Mr. Stutchbury obviously sincerely believes.

The most valuable parts of this book are those in which the author exposes those many absurdities in ecclesiastical dogma which are well known to the clergy but which the clergy pretend to think the laity have not noticed: he has said things which so needed saying that nobody had yet said them. Gratitude for this service is somewhat tempered, however, on viewing his attempt to sweep away theology along with ecclesiastical dogma. Perhaps the least successful chapter is that devoted to a discussion of Christ, where, for example (p. 25), Mr. Stutchbury dismisses Jesus' claim to Messiahship apparently on the grounds that He did not satisfy those conceptions of the Messiah which He found (and which, it seems fair to add, would have made Him less a Messiah than He appears to Christians !).

The author's own conception of a church is evidently an Ethical Society. While agreeing with him that Church Reform as thorough as he advocates is a national obligation, most readers will probably wish doctrinal reform to be reform and not annihilation, remembering that though Ethics are an important part of religion they are not religion itself. Nevertheless, many of the suggestions in this book, especially that of entrusting investigation for reform to a Royal Commission, are worth consideration; and to claim against Mr. Stutchbury that a church should teach more than ethics is not to deny that it might usefully discharge the functions of such a society as well as those more peculiarly its own; nor is it to deny that reform of the English Church is as urgent as he declares.

A. R. C. LEANEY.

CORRESPONDENCE

A UNITARIAN MINISTER IN LIVERPOOL CATHEDRAL.

SIR, To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman.*

The invitation to Mr. Lawrence Redfern, minister of the Unitarian Church in Sefton Park and a Chaplain to the High Sheriff, to preach the Assize Sermon in Liverpool Cathedral raises an issue in which Modern Churchmen cannot but be keenly interested. The editorial note and Canon Palmer's letter indicate plainly that it is in the nature of a test case; and those of us who are thankful for the action of the Dean and Chapter will rejoice to know that the *Modern Churchman* recognizes it as such. As the matter will apparently be made the subject of legal proceedings, comment

upon it can only be of a general character. But it is not improper for one no longer a member of the Chapter to state what has been the usual policy of the Cathedral in regard to such invitations.

From the first the Bishop decided that one of his chief tasks was to encourage closer co-operation between the Christians of his diocese. At the time of the consecration of the Cathedral the Lambeth Appeal of 1920 was still a vivid memory. The Copec Conference and the preparations for Lausanne had demonstrated the practicability and value of united effort. Liverpool was itself deeply divided; and Christian witness both in the City and the University was in consequence grievously weakened. Any attempt to promote evangelism or to strengthen Christianity on Merseyside must be preceded by efforts to rally and unify the Christian forces at work in the area.

The Bishop based his policy upon the clauses of the Lambeth Report. He threw his influence into support of the United Council which had been created for social service and which organized a successful conference on the Copec Report, and of the Board of Biblical Studies on which Christians of different denominations had served together for promoting lectures in divinity at the University. Out of these two grew in time the Liverpool Board of Divinity, which united Anglicans and Free Churchmen for the provision of a full programme of religious education, and which accomplishes yearly a great work of lectures and classes.

But he felt that such co-operation did not and could not go far enough. Union in worship was not only the necessary prelude to effective co-operation, but was already both desirable and legitimate. The Lambeth Report had encouraged development of the practice already well-established of inviting by special sanction of the responsible Bishop preachers from other denominations, who were known to be working for unity. Dr. David recognized that such invitations to the regular services of the Cathedral could only be occasional and under special circumstances. So in general he restricted his sanction to the congregational 'nave' service on Sunday evenings at 8.30—a service deliberately non-liturgical and evangelistic, additional to the Office. Here the practice has always been to welcome laymen like General Smuts and women like Dr. Maude Royden as well as ministers of the Free Churches; for the whole intention of the service is to provide opportunity for worship for those who are not yet attached to any Christian church and to develop a type of 'pre-denominational' evangelism.* Nevertheless he has not hesitated, where circumstances made it in his judgment appropriate, to ask representatives of other denominations to preach at Morning Prayer.

It is obvious that an Assize Service constitutes such a special occasion. Since the Consecration of the Cathedral the Dean and Chapter have always agreed to hold this service in the Cathedral, should the Judges express their wish for it; and a Chaplain of the Assize has regularly preached the sermon. If their action in welcoming Mr. Redfern is to be made the ground of legal proceedings, the whole question of the rights of the Crown will no doubt be thoroughly investigated: hitherto the Chapter has acted upon the conviction that when the King had seen fit to appoint a Chaplain it would be an affront to the Crown to refuse him as preacher. To discuss the issue further would be improper; nor am I qualified to do so by knowledge either of the law or of the exact circumstances of the present case.

One further point may be added. As was pointed out in the Editorial note in the last *Modern Churchman*, Unitarianism in England has moved a

* Such a service would clearly fall within the scope of Resolution 46 of the Lambeth Conference of 1930.

long way from its old and rather negative and rationalizing position. Many Unitarians are in fact far more properly described as Free Christians, and are men whose devotion to Christ is as conspicuous as is their spiritual power. Many of the finest Christians and most enlightened citizens of Liverpool are members of the Unitarian churches. The Unitarian ministers, men like Mr. Redfern, Mr. Vaughan and Mr. Ballantyne, have worked for years in close and happy co-operation with Anglicans and with the Cathedral clergy. No one who knows Liverpool could doubt that they were among the most potent Christian influences upon the community: no one who has enjoyed their friendship can question their fitness as ministers of Christ. It is tragic that such men exercising their ministry so worthily should be made an occasion for controversy. They will draw comfort from the knowledge (which Anglo-Catholics should surely have learnt from their own history) that when legal action is taken against Christian freedom, the victory whatever the verdict is with freedom.

It is moreover significant that the attack should now be launched by people who know little either of Liverpool or of Mr. Redfern. In the city itself such an attack will arouse little sympathy. Liverpool does not share the ignorant prejudice which regards a Unitarian as worse than an unbeliever: it will not forget the generous friendliness which Mr. Redfern and members of his church like Mr. Sidney Jones or Mr. Lawrence Holt have always shown to the Church of England: it will welcome an opportunity (as I know from personal experience) of rallying to the support of those who are striving for closer unity between the divided denominations.

Ely. CHARLES E. RAVEN.

December 26th, 1933.

A PLEA FOR A FORWARD POLICY.

SIR,

In the December issue of the *Modern Churchman*, the Editor quotes a saying of Dean Inge, as follows:

> 'Believe me, if Christianity is ever rejected as obsolete, it will be because the conscience of humanity has advanced while Christian teachers have refused to move an inch, and prefer the tradition of the elders to the living voice of the Holy Spirit of truth.'

This seems to me an admirable text for the plea I wish to put forward for a more energetic and radical policy on the part of the Modern Churchmen's Union in the New Year. The movement seems to me to be walking round the big problems rather than tackling them. Our organisation is honeycombed with intellectual reserves, and shadowed with the drabness of excessive English compromise. For over a hundred years, European scholarship and the development of science have between them rendered obsolete the forms and dogmas built up by the Early Fathers. This tremendous intellectual achievement has not failed to affect the popular attitude towards institutional religion. The ground being thus prepared, it is an unforgivable error in policy for the Union to show timidity in giving bold expression to the New Thought.

At present the Modern Churchmen's Union seems to be little more than a bodyguard for half-a-dozen eminent and occasionally outspoken clergymen and scholars who periodically send Little Pedlington into spiritual convulsions, or cause growls among the clerical greybeards at Torchester Cathedral.

Do we accept the results of the application of reason and science to historical Christianity, or do we not? Nearly all the problems discreetly discussed in the *Modern Churchman* were settled broadly by the Higher Criticism several decades ago. The rest is detail. The average educated layman understands the orthodox faith passably well, and in the majority of cases nowadays regards that body of Second and Third Century dogma as inacceptable to the modern mind. He does not, for instance, believe any longer in the Virgin Birth, nor does he accept the story of the bodily resurrection and ascension of Jesus after the Crucifixion. Modern research has revealed the indisputable fact that the intellectual and spiritual life of the twentieth century differs both in its knowledge of the laws which govern material phenomena and in its conception of Reality almost entirely from the society which gave birth to the Primitive Church. Is the Christ of Faith to be forever chained to the Jesus of myth? Is man's larger hope to be forever imprisoned in the childish eschatology of an earlier period? The old-time creeds, grown in the fruitful soil of folk-lore, legend and myth, may be explained and accepted by polished and erudite theologians in an esoteric sense, but thoughtful and educated men and women who are not specialists want to know whether—in 1934—acceptance of these doctrines is a necessary preliminary to the profession of modern Christian belief. If some of these dogmas are still essential, which are they? If none is essential, let us say so and impart a new meaning to Christian truth. The effect of a clear and informed re-statement of a rational Christian faith would be as electrical as it would be indescribably salutary.

I do not plead for any sudden revolutionary manifesto; there are other ways, no less effective. A beginning towards a general advance would be the carefully edited re-publication of some of the more epoch-making works on Christian Origins and Christian Faith which have appeared during the last fifty or sixty years. These editions should be adapted to appeal to a wide public on both sides of the Atlantic. A similar enterprise was carried through with marked success a good many years ago by the Rationalist Press Association, and the popularity of Dent's *Everyman's Library* shows what a huge market there is for good literature well but economically produced. It may be argued that such an informed and documented library of modern theology and history would shatter all hope of Christian Re-union. What hope of re-union have we, or ought we to have, with the Church of Rome? What near kinship is there between the priests, archimandrites and patriarchs of the several divisions of the Eastern Orthodox Church and the ministers and laity of Modernist English Protestantism?

A second line of advance for the Union is to throw the every-day work of the organisation more open to the laity. Why should we not have more gatherings at which lay opinion would be invited and encouraged to express itself freely? The clergy would have much to gain by the adoption of such methods. The policy of the Union is being too obviously controlled and canalised by academic thought and feeling, divorced from the main currents of industrial and commercial life.

Every Sunday Modernists are called on to repeat prayers and to make confessions of a faith in a form which they have ceased to hold. That is a fact which is rapidly undermining institutional religion and emptying the churches. If anyone doubts this tendency, let him consider the widespread loss of interest in the Bible among the masses since the War: let him also ponder over the rapid growth of peculiar religions like Latter-day Theosophy, Spiritualism, and Faith-healing.

It is neither necessary nor desirable that we should cut ourselves adrift from the historic past. But it is essential that the spiritual sustenance of the second century should not continue to be offered to the revolutionized world of the twentieth century in the name of truth.

Hampstead, N.W.3. F. VICTOR FISHER.

December 18th, 1933.

WHAT DOES MR. HARDWICK MEAN?

SIR,

It is not unnatural that Colonel Luard should have found my article, 'The Church and the Age,' a trifle sombre, but I do not think he realizes the extent of the gap between the traditional culture embodied in the Church of England and the cultural standards of the populace to-day. It is not merely a question of intellectual standards, nor even of aesthetic, but of *emotional* standards, which of course are the most important of all. I wonder if Colonel Luard is a student of the cinema, or of modern jazz music. I am no highbrow, but can recognize both primitive animality as well as debased emotionalism when I see it. The two between them form a protective armour against any civilizing attempts which the Church may make. My claim is that the Church simply cannot establish contact with the modern barbarian—the mass man whose vertical invasion is destroying our culture. Needless to say, I am not referring only, or even chiefly, to the working classes.

With regard to the disinterestedness of science, I would suggest to Colonel Luard that he should inquire of some competent authority what proportion of the scientific research at present going on in this country, at Universities as well as Research Institutes, is devoted to subjects of industrial and military importance, and what proportion to subjects of vital importance for human welfare. Why is it, too, that chemical and physical research flourish, whereas biological, psychological and sociological research languish for lack of workers and funds? Is it not that research in these latter fields does not pay financially and no commercial or national interest is served by prosecuting them? If psychological research seemed to be a paying proposition to the Fighting Services or the F.B.I. we should soon get more than enough of it.

With regard to the other point, that modern psychology has opened our eyes to the 'innate bestiality and unreason' of human nature; in doing so it has only substantiated the traditional Christian doctrine which Colonel Luard may study in the treatises of St. Augustine. But by 'bestiality' I was not referring particularly to sex: the animals, as well as primitive savages, are less highly sexed that 'civilized' man. The animals have their rutting seasons, and savages have to work themselves up by dances and religious rites into sexual activity. I was thinking rather of greed and acquisitiveness, as well as cruelty, though, to be sure, modern anthropological research has indicated that these vices are the products of civilization. The primitive savage was a cheerful, kindly, care-free fellow.

With regard to 'unreason.' If Colonel Luard regards the majority of his fellow-men and women as rational beings I can only congratulate him on his charity or on his faulty observation. I do not think the Prophets of Israel were entirely rational, but I would certainly say that they were the

most rational individuals in their community. As for the Sermon on the Mount, it is all quite logical; if you accept the view that the age is shortly coming to an end there is no point in exacting debts or avenging injuries.

J. C. HARDWICK.

Partington Vicarage, Manchester.
December 30th, 1933.

THE ESSENCE OF TOLERANCE.

SIR,

The characteristic letter from Mr. Davies on Tolerance—in which he states that he is loth to speak when the man he thinks wrong is living a life close to God and ascribes his inspiration to those very views which seem to Mr. Davis to be erroneous—is met by an article in the same number by Mr. Curnow on 'The Danger of Reserve.' He concludes that truth-telling can never be contrary to the highest well-being of any individual.

Unfortunately his conclusion is against common experience. One must be lacking in sympathy if at all times one would disturb the simple faith of the weaker brother.

The real difficulty many of us find is that in shedding superstition we get nothing definite or tangible in its place. The newer faith we try to cling to is very vague and thin and provides a poor sort of lifebelt to throw to a brother who is struggling in one of life's more serious storms, such as the loss of his nearest and dearest. The change from the God our Father of Jesus, who cared for the fall of a sparrow, to the metaphysical mystery of, say, the Dean of Exeter is not likely to be a benefit to the ordinary uncultured simple folk. It will hurt and in many cases harm, as he will cease to be a religious man at all. Many of us are trying to hang on to as much of the older faith as we can and are Modernists only reluctantly.

12 Holyroyd Road, Putney. F. G. PEARCE.
December 12th, 1933.

[Of course, the truth must in a number of cases give pain, very great pain, but was the poet right who wrote:

'When ignorance is bliss,
'Tis folly to be wise'?

Surely another poet wrote more truly:

'Not enjoyment and not sorrow
Is our destined end or way,
But to act that each to-morrow
Finds us farther than to-day.'

If the road trodden by the Modernist be hard and narrow, that is no reason for supposing that it will not lead those who tread it into the higher life. The demand for certainties, like the demand for miracles, although a very natural one, is not a Christian one. It was of Abraham, the Father of the Faithful, that it was written that in obedience to the call of faith 'he went out not knowing whither he went.' There are occasions when Modernism demands not only faith but heroism.

But so far as our experience goes, we have not found it harder to say the Lord's prayer as a Modernist than as a traditionalist. Because God does not interfere with the operation of physical laws, that is no sound reason for doubting that God is our Father.—EDITOR, *M.C.*]

THE LATE REV. C. J. SHARP.

SIR,

The C.C.C. is, I believe, the oldest existing Broad Church Society; it was founded in 1856, and Frederick Denison Maurice was elected in 1862. John Richard Green and Arthur Tennlyn Stanley were both elected in the following year. At its last meeting on December 18th the members unanimously passed the following resolution:

'The C.C.C. desires to record its sorrow on the death of its chief member, the Rev. Charles James Sharp, whose long and generous leadership has greatly benefited the Club and whose memory is held by the members in deep respect and affection. The Club also desires to convey to Mrs. Sharp and her family its respectful and heartfelt sympathy.'

I thought this information would be of interest to some of your readers.

F. I. L. REES,
President of the C.C.C.

Holy Trinity Vicarage,
10 Bessborough Gardens, S.W.1.
December 31st. 1933.

RATIONALISM AND TOLERANCE.

SIR,

May I be allowed to comment on the considered review of my book, *Rationalist Evaluations,* in your December issue. Your reviewer says I fail therein to deal with the work of modern theologians and am content to cite a sermon by Dr. Barnes. Now this I do of purpose, as it deals explicitly, on a peculiar occasion, with one of my basic propositions — the bearing of scientific views of man's origin and place in nature on traditional or historic beliefs: those held by the Roman Church, and until recent years by most Anglicans. Following the Bishop's treatment of the problem, I develop my own position, which, again, rests on a body of knowledge and conclusions that I take as understood by those to whom the argument is in the first place addressed. The relation of modern theology to the philosophy indicated in this argument is a separate issue, for it represents what is really a fresh and vital school of directive thought, which my study aims to interpret.

I would like also to advert to a letter from a correspondent in the same number on an address by a Unitarian Minister in Liverpool Cathedral. I am unacquainted with the facts, apart from his statement that 'the vehemence of orthodoxy as expressed by the Ecclesiastical Press (on this incident) is hardly less bitter now than it was sixty odd years ago, when Dean Stanley invited the Company of Revisers of the Authorised Version, including Nonconformists and a Unitarian Minister, to partake of Holy Communion in Westminster Abbey.' This display of intolerance is disquieting at a time when the Roman Church here is again arrogantly asserting her claims, supported in the press by a number of lay apostles. It parallels the anti-liberal spirit abroad in secular directions — in economic and political theory and practice. It therefore behoves all Libertarians and believers in 'a free society' to co-operate in resolute opposition to the sinister developments from whatever quarter arising and of every complexion — red, brown, black or white; to renew those principles of free thought, tolerance and open-mindedness, where new light is most essential to our situation, through which alone may we emerge successfully from our present troubles.

AUSTEN VERNEY.